



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE AMERICAN • COLLEGE •

WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT MAY BECOME



CHARLES FRANKLIN THWING

Educ 5319.14.15

**Harvard College
Library**



Gift of
The Author

**PRESIDENT THWING'S
BOOKS ON COLLEGE SUBJECTS**

American Colleges: Their Students and Work.
Within College Walls.
The College Woman.
The American College in American Life.
College Administration.
If I were a College Student.
The Choice of a College.
A Liberal Education and a Liberal Faith.
College Training and the Business Man.
A History of Higher Education in America.
Education in the Far East.
History of Education in the United States
Since the Civil War.
Universities of the World.
Letters from a Father to his Son Entering
College.
Letters from a Father to his Daughter Entering
College.
The Co-Ordinate System in the Higher Education.
The American College: What it is and What
it May Become.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

What it is, and What it May Become

BY
CHARLES FRANKLIN THWING, LL.D.
PRESIDENT OF WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
AND ADELBERT COLLEGE

New York
THE PLATT & PECK CO.

Edw 5319.14.15

✓

~~A~~



CHS 1117.14.15

Copyright, 1914, by
THE PLATT & PECK CO.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I THE PURPOSE	1
I TO GIVE A LIBERAL EDUCATION	3
II TO PROMOTE EFFICIENCY	9
III TO MAKE THE GENTLEMAN	14
IV TO FOSTER A LARGE CITIZENSHIP	17
II THE FORCE	24
I THE TRUSTEES	26
II THE PRESIDENT	38
III THE FACULTY	49
III THE STUDENT	75
I THE STUDENT'S POINT OF VIEW	76
II TO BE A THINKER	86
III THE DORMITORY	123
IV ATHLETICS	137
V RELIGION	149
VI EARNING HIS WAY	165
VII SOME MISCONCEPTIONS	170
VIII SOME CRITICAL QUESTIONS	177
IV THE METHODS AND TOOLS	190
I THE COURSE OF STUDY	190
II PRINCIPLES FOR SELECTING	191

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
V THE CONDITIONS	203
I RELATIONS TO IMMEDIATE ENVIRONMENT .	203
II IDENTITY OF EDUCATION OF MEN AND WOMEN	216
III FINANCIAL RELATIONS	234
VI THE TESTS AND RESULTS	259
I COMPARISON OF THE PRESENT WITH THE PAST	262
II TESTIMONY OF GRADUATES	265

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE

THE ideal college is neither the ideal school nor the ideal university. The school has for its aim the conveying of certain elemental facts to the mind of the pupil. The university has for its aim either the discovery of truth or the giving of professional training. The school is concerned with the student; the university with truth and the relations of truth, or with the training for a vocation.

The ideal college stands midway between the school and the university. It is concerned, like the school, with the student. It seeks to enlarge and to enrich his character, but its method and the power which it uses in this enlargement and enrichment lie less in the conveying of elemental facts, than in the interpretation and application of truth. If the college uses truth and its relations as a force, the university, on the other side, uses truth and its relations as ends in themselves. The

2 THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

college, therefore, is joined to the school by the subject who is being educated, the student, and to the university by its pursuit of truth. It is separated from the one by the higher ranges and orders of truth which it uses, and from the other by using, as a method or force, what the university employs as a final cause or purpose itself. As the late Commissioner Draper has said—"It will be a crowning glory to our republican system . . . to make certain that all . . . children have the elements and instruments of knowledge."¹ As also Professor Hanus has said—"The secondary school should especially promote the discovery and development of each pupil's dominant interests and powers: and further . . . it should seek to render these interests and powers subservient to life's serious purposes, and also to the possibility of participation in the refined pleasures of life."²

On the other side, also, Newman has in that precious book, "Idea of a University," intimated in many chapters the purpose and function of the higher education. In one part in particular, he says:—"That only is true enlargement of mind which is the power of viewing many things at once

¹ Draper, "American Education," pages 72-3.

² Hanus, "A Modern School," page 14.

as one whole, of referring them severally to their true place in the universal system, of understanding their respective values, and determining their mutual dependence. . . . Possessed of this real illumination, the mind never views any part of the extended subject-matter of Knowledge without recollecting that it is but a part, or without the associations which spring from this recollection. It makes everything in some sort lead to everything else; it would communicate the image of the whole to every separate portion, till that whole becomes in imagination like a spirit, everywhere pervading and penetrating its component parts, and giving them one definite meaning.”³

I. TO GIVE A LIBERAL EDUCATION

The primary purpose of the ideal college is to give a liberal education, or if one prefer the active voice, to give an education which liberalizes the human mind and character. But at once, the question emerges, what is a liberal education. In making a definition, I prefer to throw the question into a personal form.

Who and what is the liberally educated man in this century? For an education is liberal, because

³ Newman's "Idea of a University," pages 136-7.

it makes a liberally educated man. If one know the result, one may easily trace out the cause. Yet, when one has transferred the problem to the human side, one soon and easily discovers that all difficulties are not elided. As Socrates said, when drinking the hemlock, "You may bury me if you can catch me." The trouble is to catch the man liberally educated and to hold him long enough to have a steady look at him.

The liberally educated man, we sometimes say, is the scholar. But we all know men who are scholars who do not embody an education of a liberal type. Knowledge, even knowledge broad, accurate, well ordered, does not always give a liberal education. I found one day in a noble laboratory of a famous university, a woman who was breeding mice in order to study certain inherited tendencies in coloring. I also met an eminent zoölogist in his laboratory of a morning, who was intoxicating earthworms in order to study certain activities of their nervous system under this excitement. One knows men who can discuss *Kai Gar* and the enclitic *De*. To neither the zoölogist nor the Hellenist would one ascribe a liberal education. Is the grammarian an incarnation of the liberal type? One recalls Browning's Grammarian:—

“ ‘Grant I have mastered learning’s crabbed text,
Still there’s the comment.
Let me know all! Prate not of most or least,
Painful or easy!
Even to the crumbs I’d fain eat up the feast,
Ay, nor feel queasy,
So, with the throttling hands of death at strife,
Ground he at grammar;
Still, thro’ the rattle, parts of speech were rife:
While he could stammer
He settled *Hoti’s* business—let it be!—
Properly based *Oun*—
Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic *De*.⁴

The liberally educated man, it is sometimes said, is the thinker. The man who can reason, judge, assess a truth at its proper value, relate truth to truth, or infer a new truth, is the thinker. But there are men whose minds are as accurate in their movements as Babbage’s famous machine, who would never be judged guilty of having a liberal education. One knows such men—orderly, precise, correct, their mental operations are more regular than the movements of the heavenly bodies—but they are not liberally educated.

The man of a liberal education is a scholar, or at least is scholarly; he is a thinker, or at least is thoughtful, but he is also more than either the

⁴ Browning, Vol. IV, pages 250-2.

6 THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

thinker or the scholar, in fact, more than both. This man, liberally educated, has entered the arena of learning, yet he is not cumbered by, nor made heavy with, the treasures which he bears forth. He is still intellectually alert. He has made himself a partner in humanity's life, but he has so shared that life as to create in himself a richer selfhood. He can judge truth and assess truth at a fair value. Every man, it is said, is either a Platonist or an Aristotelian. It may be truthfully said that the best man is both a Platonist and an Aristotelian. He is able to interpret like the one and to reason like the other. Every man thinks either arithmetically or algebraically. He says either, that $4+5=9$, or that $x+y=z$. He thinks in either particular or general laws. This man of liberal education thinks in both ways. The man of liberal education has a mind deep in its fathomings without obscurity, high and noble without visionariness, broad without thinness. Its length and breadth and height are, like the City of God, equal. It is a mind rich, yet not gorged, orderly without being merely an outline of thought, self-centered without arrogance, self-contained without assumption, strong without presumption, vigorous without coarseness.

United with this mind of the man of liberal education is a heart of sympathy. Sympathy liberalizes—sets free the mind and the man. He comes to have a fellow feeling with the universe: knowledge creates love. “I hate that man.” “I thought you did not know him!” “I do not. If I knew him, I should not hate him.” As a fish has an instinct for water, the bird for air, so this man has instinct for man. “My brother” is his mood toward each. This man, if he be master of one art or one science, is sympathetic with other masters in their arts and their sciences. He may be a physicist, but he knows the philosophy which underlies physics; he may be a philosopher, but he believes in the concrete. He is never vain; humility clothes him as a garment. He has powers of substitution, he is an altruist. He can see with others’ eyes, feel with others’ hearts.

This man is also a man of appreciation of the beautiful. The ministry of art is a very real ministry to him. Through it he finds a larger soul—in it he meets his maxima. A great poem lifts him, or great prose, like some passages in Newman or Burke. He feels, also, a great piece of music, or dim spaces of a cathedral. This man has a mind to see and a heart to feel the grand, the beautiful.

8 THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

This liberally educated man is also a man righteous. He embodies the advice which Sir Walter gave to his son-in-law. Sir Walter, when dying said: "Lockhart, be a good man!" He represents those qualities which Milton intimates:

Enflamed with the study of learning and the admiration of virtue; stirred up with high hopes of living to be brave men and worthy patriots, dear to God, and famous to all ages.⁵

Any lapse from moral goodness disintegrates, not the conscience only, but the whole manhood. Man is one. He who breaks any law finds the stain and the sting touching every part of character. There is no ethical by-law. Each part is of a permanent constitution. Wrong produces self-consciousness in the wrong-doer, and in self-consciousness neither intellect nor heart works its best.

The man of liberal education lives, to use the phrase of Professor George Herbert Palmer, in fullness of life. The phrase is the concrete expression for the remark of Christ: "I came that ye might have life and have it more abundantly." Every faculty acts, every function is complete. Reason *plus* sympathy *plus* appreciation equal fullness of life. Fullness of life equals the man himself liberally educated.

⁵ Tractate: Education.

II. TO PROMOTE EFFICIENCY

If the primary purpose of the ideal college is to give a liberalizing education, a secondary purpose is to make men of efficiency. The man of efficiency is the man who does the most and the best in ways most economical. He effects greatest results at least expense. He represents service in every profession and in every form of business. He represents commerce and industrialism conducted unto richest results with smallest expenditures. He represents the practice of the law carried on with the greatest success under forms most direct and satisfactory. He represents the science and the art of teaching conducted in such ways as to give the best training to the largest number of students at a just expenditure of every force concerned. That the college has in the past helped to train men of efficiency is evident to the careful observer and wise interpreter. The value of the efficiency of this training is made evident in particular in the professions of the ministry, of teaching, of law and medicine, and of journalism.

About one-half of the ministers in the United States are college-bred. In certain churches the proportion is less than one-half, in others it is

greater. A church usually gains or loses in public influence according to the force with which it insists upon a liberal education for its clergy. This condition is at once a cause and a result. As a church becomes larger and stronger, more able and more influential among the best classes, it demands with greater urgency that its clergy shall be the better trained; and as a church comes to have better trained men in its pulpit and professorships, of course that church itself becomes stronger. The Methodist Church has gained in influence in the last years, and this church is insisting the more strongly upon a college education for its clergymen. The Congregational Church is a very influential body in proportion to the number of its members, but it is relatively less strong than it was a hundred years ago, not because of its own absolute decline, but because of the great gain in the strength of other churches, and also because it is not emphasizing as once it did the value of an educated clergy.

There has been a great gain in the influence of college men in the field of education. The primary power in all education is the teacher. The best thing that a college does for the student lies not in the subjects of his study. It is found in the teacher himself. The best thing, too, which the

grammar school or the high school does for a student is not the knowledge gained, but it is the character impressed, the motives quickened, the purposes lifted, and these results are derived primarily from the teacher himself. The college graduate will bring to his service, whether that service be found in the college or in the kindergarten, power more inspiring, finer and nobler, because of his college training. The time was when the college teacher was simply a college graduate. He is now a graduate of the university or of the graduate school. The time was when the high school teacher was simply a graduate of the high school itself. He is now a college graduate and often a university graduate. The time was when the ordinary grammar school teacher was simply a graduate of the high school and possibly a graduate of a normal school. The time is soon to come when the grammar school teacher is to be a college man or woman. Under the present conditions the college is the readiest and the most forceful method and means for securing this desired training.

Recent years, too, have seen a great change in the relations of the profession of law and of medicine to the college graduate. In the last decade at least one-fifth of all those admitted to schools of law have

received a college training. The proportion of those admitted to schools of medicine who have received a college training is much smaller, so small that it is hard to make an estimate. It possibly does not exceed seven per cent. But at the present time the movement toward the improvement of professional education is strong. Medical colleges are coming to require the evidence of a liberal training as seen in the college diploma as a necessary condition for admission. The demand made by law schools is not so general nor does it represent, in the case of most law schools, so prolonged a preliminary training, but the time is forever past when the student can go from the farm to the school of either law or medicine. The college is giving to those who are about to become lawyers or doctors a liberal training. For it is always to be said in professional studies that the beginning determines the end and the end also determines the means and the method. The legal maxim is true, and is maintained by broad experience, that he who is not a good lawyer when he comes to the bar will seldom be a good lawyer afterwards. The maxim may be made broader—he who is not a good professional student when he enters the professional school will not be a good one when he leaves it; and

if he fail to be a good professional student, he will not be a good lawyer or a good doctor when he begins his professional career. This movement toward the improvement of legal and medical education is of the richest significance for the betterment and the happiness of American life.

In all newspaper service, too, it is to be said, the college man is supplanting the man who lacks a liberal training. Some of the most conspicuous editors of the past, such as Greeley and Medill, were not college graduates. The scorn that Greeley had for the graduate has become notorious. But if one were to name the men who are the best editors to-day he would find that the great majority of them are graduates.

The efficiency of the college man is of course a result naturally expected. People differ and must differ in their judgment of the value of different methods in education, and of the worth as disciplines of different studies, but it is significant that at this time, there is a hearty agreement as to the value of the higher education for a man who is to enter any employment requiring a high degree of trained efficiency. Everyone recognizes that the disciplined mind is the best tool for doing any work; and it is needless to add that the disciplined

mind is the highest intellectual result of the training which the ideal college seeks to give.

The purpose of the college in promoting efficiency is well expressed by Sir William Stirling-Maxwell in an address which he gave as rector of St. Andrews in the year 1863. "In these professions, while solid professional learning is essential, a large and various stock of knowledge is of immense value. What morsel of erudition or scrap of science is there which may not at some time or other be turned to good account by the lawyer, whose business, touching, at all points, the whole circle of human interest and passion, may lead him into any subject on which dispute and litigation are possible, and who may, one day, have to deal with the foundations of British liberty, or the subtleties of international law, and the next to explain, clearly and neatly, the qualities of a coal or the fashion of a bobbin?"⁶

III. TO MAKE THE GENTLEMAN

Beside the two purposes of giving a liberal education and of training men of efficiency, the ideal college has a third purpose. It should seek to make the gentleman. The gentleman is man culti-

⁶ Rectorial Addresses, University of St. Andrews, page 10.

vated. The college takes the youth, callow and crude and soft, and transmutes him into a man still young indeed, but solid, solid without hardness, obedient to the call of the highest without obsequiousness, and vigorous without unbecoming aggressiveness. It takes the youth rough, uncouth, self-conscious, and cuts, chisels, carves and smoothes him into a man who is at home in any society; who can jest with the frivolous, sorrow with the sad, laugh with the gay, who forgets himself for the hour, yet who does not forget the infinite and eternal relationships, who loses himself in the fitting occasion, but who still keeps himself unto things greatest and lasting. The college takes the man jealous, sullen, moody, even mean, and, accepting the material given to it, through noble personal associates and pure and aspiring associations, makes over this man, not indeed into an archangel of light and of happiness, but into one who really finds happiness in others' happiness, as well as in his own heart, and who also does feel himself called upon to be a minister to the happiness and well-being of the race.

The university is to train the man into the gentleman without loss of power. It is to teach him to adjust himself to any condition, to be at home in

any society, to be a prince among princes without arrogance, and also to be a prince among boors without awakening boorishness. The university is to teach him to say nothings and yet with dignity; to talk with weight without heaviness, and always to inspire respect. It is to make him a gentleman of manner and of manners, and one whose manners are the natural expression of a free character. It may, indeed, help to create a gentleman of grace, but its power to create is primarily the method of transmuting the man of graciousness into a gentleman of the graces.

In the making of the gentleman, the college, above every other method, uses the personal associations which arise out of intimate friendships. That most acute critic, Walter Bagehot, has said in a paper on Oxford, "Take an uncollegiate Englishman, and you will generally find that he has no friends: he has not the habit. He has his family, his business, his acquaintances, and these occupy his time. He has not been thrown during the breathing time of human life into close connection with those who are also beginning or thinking of beginning to enter on its labors. School friendships are childish; 'after-life' rarely brings many; it is in youth alone that we can engrave deep and

wise friendships on our close and stubborn texture. If there be romance in them, it is a romance which few would tear aside.”⁷

IV. TO FOSTER A LARGE CITIZENSHIP

I also wish to add that it is the purpose of the ideal college to help to make the student a citizen of the universe. I refer, under this bald and bold phrase, to those relationships which find their source and consummation in conditions above the exterior senses, and which do present those forces and conditions which the eye cannot see nor the hand touch. Whatever be the name given to this supersensual existence, and its phenomena, whether it be interpreted as personal or impersonal, the college should not forget that to it the student does bear some relation. This existence is the universal in time and space; it is transcendental. The college that fails to present, so far as it is able, these infinite and eternal relations and intimations, fails to offer to the student the most inspiring forces for lifting his spirit and for enlarging and enriching his mind. As that unique character and Oxford leader, Mark Pattison, has said: “I decline, for myself, to be bound by the theory of those who

⁷ Bagehot's Works, Vol. I, XCII.

18 THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

maintain that education is for life, and life as it is. A Christian looks for a life beyond this life, and thinks that no theory of education can be perfect, as theory, which does not take account of that hope.”^s

These purposes of the ideal college of giving a liberal education, of training men of efficiency, of making the gentleman, and of seeking to bring the student into some relationship with the supersensual world, have been well expressed by President Hyde, of Bowdoin College, in saying: “To be at home in all lands and all ages; to count nature a familiar acquaintance, and art an intimate friend; to gain a standard for the appreciation of other men’s work and the criticism of one’s own; to carry the keys of the world’s library in one’s pocket, and feel its resources behind one in whatever task he undertakes; to make hosts of friends among the men of one’s own age who are to be leaders in all walks of life; to lose oneself in generous enthusiasms, and coöperate with others for common ends; to learn manners from students who are gentlemen, and form character under professors who are Christians;—these are the returns of a college for the best four years of one’s life.”

^s “Suggestions on Academical Organization,” page 329.

In fact, to think truthfully, to choose in righteousness and wisdom, to appreciate beauty, to feel nobly, to increase the number and the worth of one's relationships and to aid in adjusting oneself to these relationships, to give self-knowledge, self-control, self-development, to foster social efficiency, to promote reverence for all goodness and for God, to give graciousness without weakness, and strength without severity, to extend the boundaries of human knowledge, to make the thinker, the scholar, the gentleman, the great liver, the great doer, and the great man—these are intimations of the comprehensive purpose of the ideal college.

These purposes which the ideal college represents, become of special worth in a democracy and especially in a democracy which is blessed with material prosperity. For a prosperous democracy is prone to neglect scholarship. A prosperous democracy is primarily concerned with itself. Scholarship is not concerned with itself. A prosperous democracy is concerned with the present and the future. Scholarship is concerned with the past for the sake of the present. A prosperous democracy is concerned with certain effects, which may be primarily applied to the external senses. Scholarship

is concerned with intellectual relations. A prosperous democracy is in danger of being intoxicated with itself. Scholarship is humble and reverent. A prosperous democracy makes its own achievements the basis of its primary appeal to the intellect. A prosperous democracy interests itself in terms of length and square and avoirdupois, miles, acres, tons. Scholarship interprets itself in terms of knowledge, books, truth, learning. But a prosperous democracy, in its heart of hearts, knows that to secure highest results it must unite intelligence with its material qualities. It bears no antagonistic mood to scholarship. In its *highest* moods, a prosperous democracy unites and coöperates with scholarship.

The function therefore of the ideal college in making the scholar in a democracy is a most important one. For scholarship is the living expression, in the midst of democratic materialism, of the worth of ideas. Scholarship represents the unity of life to a people who are inclined to forget that there has been a past, and who are also inclined to interpret the future in terms either of vagueness and dread or of emotional glory. The scholar unconsciously teaches the lesson of self-forgetfulness in an age which is wrapped up in its own

robes of achieving. The scholar is a daily incarnation of the truth that the unseen things are the eternal things, and the seen things merely temporal. The scholar suggests that there are other standards of measure than the tables of cubic measure, and other solids than are measured by avoirdupois, and that qualities imponderable are the weightiest and the most precious.

A similar function the ideal college performs for a prosperous democracy in making the thinker. If the scholar is the possessor of the house of knowledge, the thinker is the keeper of that house and the one who is most able to assess it at its true value. In a prosperous democracy the scholar fills, in certain relations, a more important part than the church. He is not regarded, however, as an important part of its life. But a democracy cannot scorn the thinker. The scholar may limit his special usefulness to a single field of learning. But the thinker is required in every field. The need of him is as great, both in time and space, as is the need of efficiency. Every process of the democracy, legislative, judicial, financial, civil, political, commercial, domestic, demands the thinker. In the legislature he is required. The presence on the statute books of laws which can be

interpreted in opposite ways, the presence of superfluous laws, and the presence of laws which, however well intended, are pestiferous, promoting the very evils which they are designed to cure, are proof that the absence of the thinker is a serious misfortune, in any government and especially in a democratic government. The need of the thinker in the judiciary and the financial departments of a prosperous democracy is obvious. The power to think is strictly the power to weigh evidence. In commercial relations also, the thinker is the ruling power. Therefore the college is rendering large advantage to a democracy through the training of the thinker.

In particular, and in America, the ideal college is to fit men to live in useful and noble relations. In the first years of a political democracy the leisure of those who are its members is usually given to sports and pastimes of either a trivial or boorish character. Sad is the natural result of the materialistic constitution of the democracy itself. But as a democracy develops, its pleasures, like its work, become more and more noble in condition and method. For there are many elements in the best service to the people which can be more easily taken up by individuals than by the formal gov-

ernment. In England men of leisure enter political life and become most useful members of Parliament, of local government, or municipal boards. In the United States it would be well if such men would enter political life; but the cost of securing a nomination and an election not only in money but in personal feelings is so great that men hesitate to seek such offices. But such men in America should devote themselves to service of a semi-official sort which is for the benefit of humanity. College graduates who are relieved of the necessity of earning their living should do all they can to make the life of the community finer and nobler.

CHAPTER II

THE FORCE

IF the purpose of the ideal college is thus high and broad, concerned with nothing lower and nothing narrower than the best interests of man, the force which is to be used in securing this noble aim is likewise human. Man is that force. Indeed, there is no method or process in which the human is not the chief element. The success of every blast furnace or steel plant arises more from the men who manage it than from the completeness of mechanical contrivance. As has said the head of one of the great industrial undertakings in the world: "I would like to say now that the greatest factor in organization, in my estimation, is the human factor. It is not things that make life—it is people. It is not things that make business—it is people—people with red blood in their veins, men and women with hearts and feelings and aims and ambitions—men and women susceptible to encouragement and sympathy and training and discipline. This is the greatest and most important raw

material that every modern business man aiming to do a large business, must deal with.”¹ If such be the truth, in manufacturing paints or refining oil, how much more evident is the truth that the human element is the chief force in education, higher or lower. Personality is the supreme power.

This human force manifests itself in organization. The ideal college is an organization legal and social. In its legal relation, it is a creature of the state made either by specific statute or under the general law. Its general relations, both legal and social, are indicated in the definition given by the Regents of the Education Department of the State of New York.

“An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college or university work, a course of four full years of college grade in liberal arts and sciences, and should require for admission, not less than the usual four years of academic or high school preparation, or its equivalent, in addition to the pre-academic or grammar school studies.”²

¹ “Modern Business Methods.” Address of Mr. Walter H. Cottingham delivered before The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, March 18th, 1911. Page 7.

² Handbook 17, State of New York Education Department, pages 3-4.

I. THE TRUSTEES

In the organization of the college, the governing body is known as the Board of Trustees, or Directors, or Regents. The term Regent is on the whole confined to the state university.

The trustees of a collège are its legislature and supreme court. They represent and are its sovereign power. Even if this power, in extreme instances, be as seldom exercised as the veto power of the King of England, yet that power is constant and ultimate. Their form of appointment may differ, by a church, by graduates, by self-perpetuation, yet they constitute the final authority. The executive is of their appointment, the faculty of their election, or confirmation, and policies and methods depend ultimately upon their approval.

It is difficult to find, and I sometimes think, of increasing difficulty, proper men for the Board of Trustees for the ideal college. The difficulty lies right at the point that the community does not create a sufficient number of men fitted to do the work which belongs to an academic board. As Bagehot says of competent legislators³ that they are very rare, so one can say that men qualified for

³ Works IV, 258.

a Board of Trustees, are much more rare than one likes to believe.

A trustee of the ideal college should possess the cardinal intellectual virtues. He should have intellectual interests. He should appreciate the worth of such interests for the individual, and for the community, in conserving the best of the past, and in creating yet better forces in and for the future. He may be a scholar,—it is well if he is; his scholarship adds luster to a body in which scholars are not common, nor their influence sufficiently felt. But, at least, he should be sympathetic with, and appreciative of, scholarship, and his heart should be loyal to the scholar. If he have a broad knowledge yet without scholarship, even this is most advantageous, but whether with or without knowledge or scholarship, his judgment should be large, accurate, sound. He should be able to see relations and great relations, too. He is inclined to err in thinking small things in correct ways. He is in peril of provincialism. He is inclined to reflect and to debate in terms of the locality or of the day. He wishes to be safe. He lets the possible better be sacrificed upon the altar of the well enough. His thinking should be alert as well as comprehensive, vital as well as accurate. In-

terpretative should be his mental type and outlook.

In his possession of the intellectual virtues are included an appreciation of the higher education as a means and method of promoting the intellectual well-being of the community. Diverse are such means and methods. The church, the family, literature, companionship may be used in securing this great result of intellectual well-being. The trustee should know that the higher education is necessary for humanistic service, and he should be so satisfied in his conscience of the worth of the higher education that his satisfaction shall become a force in his will in its behalf. He is committed to the cause of the college. The college is not, like the church, created primarily to perpetuate or even to promote religion. It is not, like the family, formed to promote the domestic virtues. It does not, like literature, or art of any sort, have as its primary purpose the giving of pleasure. The college represents the higher intellectual interests of the community. Without the proper protection and endowment of these interests, the church would languish, its altar fires burn out, and its pulpits become dumb. The home too would become narrow. Literature would die. In the demand for the prac-

tical, it is to be borne in mind that the most practical thing is the power to think, and in the demand for the efficient, it is to be remembered that the most efficient thing is the mind. The nobler the thinking, the more comprehensive and accurate, and the more definite and profound it is, the greater is its practical worth and the richer the reward which it brings to the thinker. Lord Kelvin, through his compass, helped to give safety to everyone who sails, and Pasteur, also by means of his researches, added billions of francs to the worth of the wine and silk industries of France, and gave safety and immunity to millions of human lives. Of such values of the higher education, the trustee is to be keenly appreciative.

The trustee is also to be of the hopeful and progressive mood in both intellect and will. He is indeed to be conservative in the presence of all the good of the past. Such good has been gained only at tremendous cost. It is not to be wasted or tarnished. But he is also to recognize new conditions, to see the new duties which these conditions impose, and to be keen to do these duties. Conservatism makes a strong appeal to the mind intellectually and normally indolent. Progressiveness makes a strong appeal to the mind intellectually alert

and normally active. His mind is to be alert, alert in a quickening which is as far remote from narrowness as it is from superficiality. He is thus to be a leader, and in his leadership both intellectual and ethical virtues, as well as other personal qualities, are to be united.

To secure members of this progressive type, it is well to elect men when they are young. The ordinary trustee board is composed of men too old. Seldom should an old man be chosen. If a board is subject to constant renewal by an automatic process after a service of three or five years, men of any age may fittingly be elected, but if the place is regarded as permanent, only those who have not passed beyond mature middle life are usually to be selected. Yet it is to be said that the experience of a mature member may be more useful than the activity of a new member.

With these elements are to be joined the elements of conciliatoriness. Every board consists of individuals and individuals represent individualisms. But every board is to be guided by certain principles, to move along certain lines of recognized methods, and to be inspired by certain motives. The trustee is to find out at what points dif-

fering methods may coincide, and to seek to unite diverse forces unto efficiency. The wise despot of a board of trustees, if he do ever exist, is wise enough not to be a despot. Democratic is the wisest and best board. The board that is most democratic in method is most likely to be aristocratic and sound in its conclusions. Such a mood of conciliation is vastly promoted by what Bagehot, in speaking of the first prerequisite of an elective government, calls "mutual confidence."⁴ The members of a board of trustees, whether they be seven or seventy, must have confidence in each other. This confidence is to be intellectual, having respect for each other's judgment; and moral, having regard for each other's preferences and purposes. Such mutual esteem is simply a mark of gentlemen who are engaged in doing a great public duty, in carrying forward a great public trust under similar conditions and by similar methods. Differences are sure to arise. They awaken debate and discussion, but they will never become dissensions or divisions in case members have confidence in each other. I believe that a proper interpretation of a historic division in the

⁴ Works IV, 258.

board of trustees of Princeton University illustrates the possibility of the fact, as well as the administrative value of the conciliatory mood.

As the late President Gilman says, speaking of trustees, "They must not only be men of honor, wise and unselfish, but they must be able to get on with one another. The board must include so many persons that a diversity of views may be represented; it must be so limited that the personal attention of every member is secured. Probably the world recognizes chiefly the largeness of Johns Hopkins' bounty, its largeness in amount, in scope, and in freedom from minor restrictions; but he might have failed in the choice of men to administer his trust. On the contrary, he made a capital selection, from among laymen, resident in Baltimore, in middle life, independent, and acquainted with affairs."⁵

The pecuniary, or financial, relations of trustees do, in public discussion, receive too great notice. It is often stated that only rich men are chosen to academic boards, and that the chief duties of such men, once made members, is to subscribe for increase of endowments or for the making-up of deficits. Such a remark is one of those half or

⁵ "The Launching of a University," page 20.

quarter truths, which are the most evil form of all deceptions. It does not require a prolonged argument to prove that the ideal college requires much money. It also is no more obscure that trustees are trustees. They are to cause their trust to prosper. Therefore, they are to make sure that proper income be provided. Of course they wish to furnish their proper share. Be it said also that the trustees of the American college are giving money to their college, to an amount which the world has never known, with a largeness of spirit and a happiness which awaken keenest gratitude from every fair-minded man. To say that the amounts which the college receives are small, is false, as false as to say that the mood of these rich givers is selfish. The community can trust college trustees. But what is more important is that the whole community should be so moved by the example of academic trustees in giving, that they should prove their interest in the cause of higher education by gifts equally generous and equally constant. It is no more the duty of the trustees than it is of any other member of a whole community to be altruistic.

Not only should the trustee be, as he is, generous to his college, but also he should be able to invest

funds properly. The proper investment of trust funds is one of the most important of his duties. The qualities which go to constitute a good trustee of a private estate, are the qualities demanded in an academic trustee, who is called on to make investments. These qualities are sound judgment respecting funds, real or personal, prudence, caution, vigilance, a sense of proportion, and always, of course, integrity. All interests personal to himself are to be absolutely prohibited. The record of the investment of the funds of the American college, for almost 300 years, is a record of wisdom, and honesty, and of productiveness. Whatever losses have occurred, and they have been few and small, have arisen, as in the case of most bank failures, in the desire first, either to get a high rate of interest, or second, to promote some private or personal undertaking. But the college has been remarkably free from such adventures and adventurers, and the ideal college of the future will be even still more free from such evil influences.

The most marked instance of a lack of sound judgment in the investment of funds is found in the early history of the Johns Hopkins University. In the legacy which Mr. Hopkins made to the Uni-

versity, were included fifteen thousand shares of the stock of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Mr. Hopkins's confidence in the prosperity of that railroad was absolute and he enjoined the trustees to watch over and protect the interests of that road. At the time of his making his legacy, the annual dividends were ten per cent. The chairman of the finance committee of the road was made president of the board itself, and the president of the road was made chairman of the finance committee of the university board. This double combination was most unfortunate. The bankruptcy of the railroad threatened bankruptcy of the university.⁶

But the confidence which the community has in the integrity of a board of trustees has usually been well merited. Such confidence is a most precious asset. Without it, no college can worthily exist. With it, there is no worthy academic opportunity which is denied unto it. The ideal college is the splendid outcome of a long, heroic struggle, and the trustees of such a college represent the best.

There is also one important function of the trustee which is best expressed in a negative way. He

⁶ Gilman, "The Launching of a University," pages 29-30.

is not an executive. He is not the president of the college, nor is he a substitute for the president. The president is the administrator, the executive. When a trustee seeks to take up executive work he is interfering with the function of the president. If there be a type of trustee as in some institutions there is, who may be called a "dummy," there is also at the other extreme the executive trustee who seeks to do duties which do not belong to him. Such matters of administration as the details of the course of study, the number of hours which an individual professor should teach, the discipline of students, represent administrative duties which do not belong to him. He is concerned with tendencies and movements in a course of study, with the amount of work which the professorate should do and also with the general good order of the college, but he is not concerned with specific and individual details under any one of these heads. Such details belong to the executive, which if he be at all fitted for his place, he should be able to perform.

Two important questions regarding the constitution of the board of trustees emerge. One question refers to the method of election, and one to the size of the membership.

Most boards of trustees are close corporations, choosing their own members. The disadvantage of this method is the peril of narrowness, or the lack of sympathy with academic ideals or human relationships. This peril, however, does not exist to the extent commonly attributed to it, for the membership usually represents a brief term. Removal by death or resignation is far more frequent than commonly believed. Furthermore the board of trustees of a college is usually composed of large-minded and great-hearted citizens. They seek to make their college minister in ways most effective to the welfare of the community. The disadvantage of a board choosing its own membership is much less than the peril which lies in a form of election more or less popular. Even if a board is chosen entirely of and by the graduates of a college, it will be found, I believe, that conditions would result in securing a membership no more just or sane or progressive or efficient.

The size of the board should be determined, I think, by two considerations:—first it should be small enough to give to each member a sense of deep individual responsibility. It should, secondly, be large enough to be representative of the many and diverse interests of the college. President

Eliot believes that seven is the best number, for, he says, "That number of men can sit round a small table, talk with each other informally without waste of words or any display or pretense, provide an adequate diversity of points of view and modes of dealing with the subject in hand, and yet be prompt and efficient in the despatch of business. In a board of seven the different professions and callings can be sufficiently represented."⁷

II. THE PRESIDENT

The president of the board of trustees is the president of the college, at least in its legal sense. In some cases, the one who is called the president of the college is the president of the faculty only. But in other instances, both as a fact and as a duty, the chief executive is the president of the board of trustees.

In the resolutions passed by the corporation of Boston University on the occasion of the observance of its twenty-fifth anniversary, addressed to its first and then only president, Dr. Wm. F. Warren, these phrases were used: "To mold the destinies of institutions"—"the wise and liberal counsels of one who has held steadily to the highest and

⁷ "University Administration," by Charles W. Eliot, page 3.

most comprehensive ideals"—“the catholic and progressive spirit.” These phrases are significant of general duties, as well as replete with intimations of happy personal relationships and official achievements. A president should be able to mold the destinies of the institution of which he is the chief executive. A president should be able to give counsels wise and liberal, and he should also be able to hold steadily, both in time and in condition, to the highest and most comprehensive ideals. He should also and always embody and manifest a catholic and progressive spirit.

The office of the college president is regarded as, on the whole, the most difficult to which a man can be elected. The difficulty does not, as a matter of fact, be it at once said, inhere so much in the office itself, as in the incompetency of the officer. For most college presidents are not qualified to do the special duties entrusted to them. These duties assume a vast variety of forms. In the public mind, that form of work associated with the raising of money is the most conspicuous. The president, of course, is interested in the financial success of the institution. If he can be of greater service to it by raising money directly, raising money is his duty, and should be regarded as his privilege. But

he can raise money, perhaps more effectively, through others than through himself. The work which he seeks for his college to do should constitute the strongest appeal for funds. The personal character of the president himself may also attract gifts. In the administration of President Kirkland of Harvard College, from 1810 to 1828, the institution received a larger sum of money than it received in any of the following presidencies until that which began in 1869. The cause lay, in a large degree, in the personal character and charm of the president himself. But most presidents are not as gifted as was the gracious Kirkland. Most college presidents, moreover, are not qualified by training or by the endowment of nature, for raising money for their colleges. Most do the job, but do it with awkwardness and at a terrible expense to themselves, and often to the institutions which they seek to enrich.

College presidents are also in grave peril of not taking a large and generous view of the duties of their office. They, too often, indirectly at least, promote sectionalism or factionalism among their associates. Not infrequently one is chosen to a presidency in order to smooth out the ruffles of academic disagreement. His is supposed to be

the *placidum caput* before which the stormy college ocean shall subside into quietness. But, as a fact, more frequently and more easily, his presence creates tempests either great or small. A college faculty is a pretty close corporation, in the social and personal sense. The relations of its members are intimate and constant. The business which it has to do is important. The trusts committed to it are serious. The members, too, represent a community more or less segregated. They are frequently so devoted to their own academic work that the outside interests which they hold are made either few or insignificant.

In such a condition it is easy for misunderstandings to arise. Misunderstandings easily become disagreements, and disagreements harden themselves into factionalism. In such an atmosphere a college president is to be large-minded, great-hearted, ever seeking to be absolutely just, and always considerate and kind. In case he fail, either in idea or in purpose or in wisdom of method, the result cannot but tend to abbreviate his term of usefulness.

The college president is also in peril of interpreting his office as more important than a sane and calm judgment would allow. Eager, aggres-

sive, tireless, he desires that the college shall advance. Lacking the virtue or the defect of patience, and the college not advancing, he becomes either aggrieved or irritated. Humiliated or maddened, he becomes the cause of irritation to his official superiors, or subordinates. The fact is, he lacks those great qualities which Thomas Fuller suggests as the attributes of the good master of a college. Governing boards are usually composed of gentlemen to whom the college is not of primary significance. Other interests are to them dearer, and demands other than those which the college makes are more imperative. They are willing to permit the college to pursue, by ordinary methods, under fixed conditions, its easily attainable ends. They, therefore, find it difficult to sympathize with the overmastering energy of a most progressive president. Presidents are liable to lack patience, and staying power. Governing boards are liable to lack the spirit of progressiveness. The biography, therefore, of American college presidents, has on the whole been a history of burdened hearts, often breaking, of noble plans, nobly conceived, rudely and suddenly nipped, or slowly withering. Great exceptions are to be found, but the common griefs and the not unusual result, have their beginning in

the hard experience of the first two presidents of the oldest American college, and the record of disappointment has been continued in hundreds of colleges in the last two and more centuries. As one college president, who had resigned a decade earlier than the time the remark was made, said to one who had just retired, "You, too, have joined the noble army of martyrs."

Yet, despite these difficulties, the office of the president of the good college is replete with deep satisfactions.

The first of these satisfactions relates to what I call the transmutation of values. The college president is privileged to endeavor to change money into character and into scholarship, and to change character of a low degree of excellence into character of high and higher degrees of excellence. He is privileged to endeavor to show men who have a hundred thousand dollars or a hundred times a hundred thousand that this money, which, in the ordinary processes, will become scattered among their grandchildren and great grandchildren so as to be unrecognizable in a hundred years, may be so used as to represent a mighty force for the development of the individual and the improvement of humanity. Money as an end is unworthy, but money as a

means to a noble end is most worthy. The college president seeks to transmute gold into the character and scholarship of the individual student. He also is privileged to transmute money into strength and comfort for his associates of the teaching staff. I recall some years ago giving to a gentleman, an eminent teacher in his college, and better acquainted with a certain branch of scientific investigation than any other man, a check for \$100. I gave it to him with an apology that the amount was so small. At once he turned upon me with the remark, "That sum of money means whether I shall or shall not have a summer vacation." I have never been so impressed with the worth of a few dollars to the American scholar and teacher. The college has the opportunity of receiving money for its teachers, and, through them, transmuting it into the highest element of being.

A constant joy of the college president lies in the presence of what I call the institution-building sense. He knows more or less clearly that he is doing a work which is to last, a work, too, which has relation with the highest elements of humanity. Most corporations ultimately dissolve; most forms of business eventually go to pieces. Changes in the constitution of humanity necessitate changes in

the work of humanity. But the college president knows that so long as man is man, so long man will think; so long as man is man, so long will the trained mind have great worth; so long as man is man, so long the human mind will seek to discriminate the false from the true. Therefore, so long as the constitution of humanity remains what it is now, so long the college must have an important place. The position, too, occupied by the college is not one of the future only; it enters into the higher life of the race at the present instant. In this condition truth, judgment, duty, the relations of individual to individual, of the community to other communities, of church to state, of state to church, of literature, of society, play a mighty part. It is much for a college president to feel that in such affairs he has any share. Be it said, too, that a condition of this character gives the college president a sense of power. He represents the creative process and evolution. He is himself, to a certain extent, a creator. This work, moreover, is one which allows the use of every power of his being. No charm of manner, no grace of conduct, no virtue or no verity belongs to him but that he can make use of it in service for and through his college. Such an opportunity creates a sense of exultation.

The college president, too, is aware that one of the satisfactions of his office is found in its associates and associations. The members of the teaching staff with whom he moves every day represent the finest type of the scholar and the gentleman. The students also with whom he lives are a magnificent beginning for the eternal and present life in which he daily delights to invest his little all. The parents, too, of his students are the best people in the community, and they never show themselves in a better way than when they are talking with him about the education of their sons and their daughters. The members, too, of the community who are interested in his college, or whom he seeks to interest, are among the choicest representatives of the whole body of people. His daily duties are done, and his daily pleasures enjoyed, therefore, for, through and with the best people.

Perhaps the keenest satisfaction, approaching most closely to a sense of triumph, which the college president enjoys is found in the career of his students after they have ceased to be his students. Every college president calls up scores or hundreds of graduates in whom he exults as a father or mother exults in the career of a noble child. One boy came to college rich in brain but poor in purse,

who, after a great career in this country and in Germany, has gone into educational work in China. Other boys, and a great many of these one might think of, have become teachers in American schools and colleges. Another, after a studentship most worthy, became the principal of a great school, seeking to lead others in the path which he himself trod so well. Many others one recalls who as lawyers are endeavoring to represent the art and science of human conduct worthily. Another, after four years of service on a newspaper, has already come into a place of exalted power. The list every college president may extend almost indefinitely. For to call up the names gives a sense of humble pride, and a sense of noble exultation. It is the feeling of the parent, "Because of my doing for that boy what I have done he is able to do his work in the world."

Such are some of the difficulties, and also of the satisfactions, of the president of a college. These satisfactions grow largely out of the simple doing of his duty. Regarding the specific duties of the president, the greatest of all the presidents of the last forty years, has well said: "The president's first duty is that of supervision. He should know what each officer's and servant's work is, and how it is

done. But the days are past in which the president could be called on to decide everything from the purchase of a door-mat to the appointment of a professor. The principle of divided and subordinate responsibilities, which rules in government bureaus, in manufactories, and all great companies, which makes a modern army a possibility, must be applied in the university. The president should be able to discern the practical essence of complicated and long-drawn discussions. He must often pick out that promising part of theory which ought to be tested by experiment, and must decide how many of things desirable are also attainable, and what one of many projects is ripest for execution. He must watch and look before—watch, to seize opportunities to get money, to secure eminent teachers and scholars, and to influence public opinion toward the advancement of learning; and look before, to anticipate the due effect on the university of the fluctuations of public opinion on educational problems; of the progress of the institutions which feed the university; of the changing condition of the professions which the university supplies; of the rise of new professions; of the gradual alteration of social and religious habits in the community. The university

must accommodate itself promptly to significant changes in the character of the people for whom it exists. The institutions of higher education in any nation are always a faithful mirror in which are sharply reflected the national history and character. In this mobile nation the action and reaction between the university and society at large are more sensitive and rapid than in stiffer communities. The president, therefore, must not need to see a house built before he can comprehend the plan of it. He can profit by a wide intercourse with all sorts of men, and by every real discussion on education, legislation, and sociology.”⁸

III. THE FACULTY

The president is the force uniting the board of trustees with another board, usually called the faculty. The faculty is, after all, the immediately controlling and prevailing element in the ideal college, and for its effectiveness, the administration exists. Never does the faculty exist for the sake of the administration. If the teaching staff be able, the college is efficient. If the teaching staff be unable, the college is inefficient.

⁸ “Educational Reform,” Charles W. Eliot, pages 34-35: Inaugural Address.

The methods to be used in securing a proper staff are determined largely by the conception held of the college itself as an academic democracy, or as an academic autocracy. If the college be interpreted as an autocracy, the method is simple enough. The president is the chief or only agent in making elections. His wisdom and will prevail, if wisdom he have. He seeks out, decides upon, nominates to the board of trustees those whom he judges worthy to become members of the faculty. This method obtains in many institutions. In some the method is used rather ruthlessly, but in most, it is used with a fair degree of discrimination, discernment and general respect for the opinion of his colleagues.

But I cannot believe that such autocracy represents the most effective or the wisest way of securing an able teaching staff. The wisdom of many ought to be wiser than the wisdom of one, just as much wiser as the efficiency of one is more achieving than the efficiency of a multitude, or even of an oligarchy. A faculty working with a president in agreement of judgment and harmony of feeling embodies the most effective method. Such a method represents coöperation, sympathy and proportion. A faculty will err in its selections of

new members, but it will err less frequently and less seriously than will the single chief executive. If one were to examine the teaching staff of a hundred American colleges in which the two methods prevail, he would find, in my opinion, that the colleges selecting by the democratic method, have secured abler teachers, and more efficient, than have the colleges choosing by the method of autocracy.

One value, constant and large, in such a democratic method, lies in the fact that this method promotes the *esprit de corps* of the teaching staff. A faculty changes rapidly. In a growing college, within a score of years, only one-tenth of the members found at the beginning of the period will be found remaining at its close. The older members, choosing their own membership, normally feel a warmer welcome for newcomers chosen by themselves, than for newcomers who are appointed by a president. These new men themselves, too, are naturally more responsive to conditions which are broad, arising out of a body of twenty, or thirty, or more men, than to conditions springing from the brain and heart of one man, be that man ever so wise, or ever so kind.

In selecting teachers, the American method is

for the college to take the initiative. It is the suitor. Not in good taste is it regarded for a candidate to present his own merits. The contrast with the English method is marked. The English method allows the candidate to become himself an active petitioner. He is often requested so to do. Advertisements in the *Times*, or the *Spectator*, frequently make requests for the presentation of evidences of fitness. When William Thomson, known to the world as Lord Kelvin, wished to become a candidate for the chair of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow, he wrote to thirteen of the electors, saying, "I take the liberty of announcing to you my intention of becoming a candidate for that situation; and, as soon as I shall have it in my power, I shall transmit to you testimonials in support of my application."⁹ The English method is in bad taste enough, though this badness is relieved somewhat by its frankness. The American method is more normal, more self-respecting to both seeker and sought, and more promising of securing satisfactory results.

Every means should be used to promote the *esprit de corps* of a faculty. The happiness of its members is important in itself, and this happiness

⁹ "Life of Lord Kelvin," Vol. I, page 164.

is also important as a means for securing efficiency. Divisions, cliques, clans, are liable to spring up in a body composed of strong personalities, as college teachers usually are, and always ought to be. Differences of judgment arise over methods of administration and of teaching, and also over values and emphases to be placed on different subjects of study. Colleges located in small communities, communities in which the college itself is the community, are more liable to be the seat of such divisions, lamentable as they are, than are colleges located in cities. In the larger conditions, academic concerns seem less prone to get on the nerves. Other interests come in to modify and to compose. Differences of judgment, and of practice regarding the fundamental affairs of a college, are destructive and liable to prove disastrous. Even if a body of students do not directly recognize such divisions, although in many cases they are acquainted with the facts, yet they do feel the deadening influence of such personal and executive differences. Team work is as essential and necessary in a college faculty, as it is in a football eleven. One method of developing such a spirit lies in making, as I intimated, a faculty responsible for its own membership.

A second method or condition for securing a proper faculty lies in the largeness of mind, of heart, and of will, of the president. He is ever to be an illustration of the intellectual appeal to the highest. He is never to suffer a mean prejudice or indeed any prejudice to arise in himself, and also is he never under any condition to show a prejudice. His is not a party government; he is a constitutional sovereign. He is to be an altruist, intellectual, to see with the eyes of each of his associates; he is also to be an altruist emotional, to feel the heart of each of his official brethren and co-workers. I am confident that academic history proves that faculties which have been most distinguished for a great spirit have had large-minded and large-hearted men as their presidents; and also that faculties which have occasionally become notorious for division, have usually been obliged to suffer from presidents not distinguished by intellectual breadth of vision, or by depth of fine feeling.

The methods and principles, moreover, which determine the selection of the members of the faculty, also apply to promotions within the body itself. Seldom do men begin their academic career as full professors. The fundamental rule

which determines promotions, is based upon the value of a teacher to a college. Among the elements of such valuation are five: first, ability as a teacher; second, scholarship; third, the making of original investigations, or the writing of books, or of papers, or other forms of publication; fourth, personal character, as embodying the great purposes for which a college stands; and fifth, interest in the general relations and public welfare of a college.

It is well to make promotions as rapidly as conditions allow. The reasons for such a method lie on the side of both the teacher and of the college. A teacher is, as a rule, more efficient in a primary than in a subordinate place. He realizes the significance of the nobler position. This realization is most valuable as an incentive. The welfare of the teacher, too, encourages promotion. The peril of retention, more or less lasting, in a secondary position, cuts the nerve of eagerness in attainment. The number of assistant professors and instructors found on the faculties of many colleges, is appalling and discouraging.

It is, however, to be acknowledged that a multiplicity of full professors necessitates special discernment and discretion. In a small college one

full professor of each department may be sufficient. In a large college, several professors may be necessary, or at least advantageous, but these several should be each assigned to different parts of a single great field. Fifty years ago, there was, in many colleges, a single professor of science, or of the sciences. To-day, in many colleges, the divisions of the sciences are numbered by the score or scores, and the full professors are equally numerous. It is to be said, however, that each of the great subjects, though having several professors, may avoid conflict by constituting either temporarily, or permanently, one member as the acting head of the department.

It is, however, often the duty of official boards, not simply to promote, but also to dismiss, members who prove that they are not efficient. No board of trust is justified in retaining upon its teaching staff those whose value is slight. The rights of the donors of funds, the rights of students, as well as the rights of the public, may not be so impressive to a board of trust, or to a faculty, as are the presumed rights of a single teacher who is incompetent, but they are rights which are intrinsically of far greater importance. The duty of excusing professors who have proved their in-

competency is one very hard to perform, and should always be performed with the utmost consideration and considerateness, but it is a duty which should be done. I am sorry to say that often it is not done, and also in too many cases in which it is done, it is performed without proper carefulness.

The question of promotion has close relation to the question of compensation, for as a rule, the higher the professorial grade, the larger the stipend. The principle touching the amount of the stipend is, I believe, this: every college should seek to pay the largest possible salary to its teachers. Money should be saved from all other points of expenditure, in order to conserve and to increase the salary budget. All other sources of expense represent means or methods for making more efficient the work of the teaching staff. If the choice lies, as it sometimes does lie, between, on the one side, erecting more, or more beautiful, buildings, and the introducing of more valuable equipment, and between, on the other side, the increase of the stipend of professors, the weight of evidence inclines towards getting along with present buildings and equipment, and giving more proper income to the real force of the college, the teacher. One of the marked contrasts between

continental and English universities, and American, lies in the splendor of American college halls, and the indifference of American scholarship, and on the other side, the distinction of European scholarship and the indifference of the environment and the equipment in which the scholar carries on his researches, or teaches his classes. The Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge, and the great work there done, and Kelvin's rooms at Glasgow, and the tremendous services thence rendered, are pregnant illustrations. Exceptions of course there are, but the general truth is altogether too true.

The facts regarding the stipends of college teachers are patent enough and are almost as sad as they are evident:—

“The average salary of a full professorship ranges from \$1,350 to \$4,788, but there only eight institutions paying an average salary of less than \$1,800 to the full professor, and also only eight institutions giving an average salary of \$3,500 or over.¹⁰ Thirty-five institutions pay between

¹⁰ These eight institutions are:

1. College of the City of New York	\$4,788
2. Harvard University	4,413
3. Columbia University	4,289
4. Leland Stanford Junior University	4,000
5. University of Chicago	3,600

\$1,700 and \$2,100. Forty-seven institutions pay between \$2,100 and \$3,200. The most common average salary is one between \$2,000 and \$2,100, found in fourteen institutions. Half of the institutions give less than \$2,200. Allowing for the varying numbers of professors in the different institutions, the average salary of a professor in the hundred strongest colleges and universities of America may be safely taken to be close to \$2,500. The most frequently salary will be lower.”¹¹

It is also true that:

“In only five institutions in America is the possibility for a professor greater than five thousand five hundred dollars. Four of these institutions are universities located in New York, Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia. In these four cities a lawyer, a physician, or an engineer does not have to attain extraordinary eminence to receive several times the salary which is the utmost hope of the college teacher. Good, plodding men, who attend diligently to their profession but who are without

6. University of Toronto	3,600
7. Yale University	3,500
8. University of Pennsylvania	3,500
also The General Theological Seminary	4,000

and a residence. Since these statements were made, the salaries in certain institutions have been increased.

¹¹ “The Financial Status of a Professor in America and in Germany.” Bulletin 2 of the Carnegie Foundation, page 21.

unusual ability, often obtain at middle life an income considerably higher than a man of the greatest genius can receive in an American professor's chair." ¹²

It is also further said:

"The presidency of a great university demands talent and administrative skill of a very high order. The salaries are not much above the upper range of what a professor may receive. In the great cities of the country the really great lawyers earn from sixty to one hundred thousand dollars a year. The prevalent opinion seems to be that the physicians and surgeons of great eminence and reputation receive from fifty to one hundred thousand dollars a year. Exceptional years occur when even these figures are exceeded by the leaders of the professions. It must be considered what effect these facts, not to speak of the fortunes possible to business skill, have upon the high-spirited youth about to choose a life work. If he selects college or university teaching the utmost limit he can hope for will be the financial success attained by the average man of his class who chooses the other professions. In other callings great ability brings a proportionate reward; the

¹² *Idem*, page 25.

best man may expect from twenty to forty times the reward of the average man. In industry and business the best man may expect from two hundred to four hundred times the reward of the average man. But in teaching and scholarship the best man cannot, under present conditions, expect much more than two to four times the financial reward of the average man. No matter how great the ability of the college professor as a teacher or scholar, there is no working probability that he will ever be paid more than a minor officer of a railroad or industrial company.

“It is not strange that the possibility of teaching seldom presents itself seriously nowadays to the best students in a large graduating class. That gifted men do enter the profession of teaching is due solely to the love of teaching, study, and research. The fiscal arrangements of the profession of college teaching are just such as would attract a mediocre person who did not expect that in any other activity the world held out to him very much. The need for larger prizes is pressing.”¹³

Yet, be it at once said, the outlook for the foundation of these larger prizes is not bright.

¹³ *Idem*, page 25.

In that great book,—among the greatest ever written,—“The Wealth of Nations,”—Adam Smith suggests some of the principal circumstances which determine the pecuniary compensation of employments. They are, first, the agreeableness or disagreeableness of the employments themselves; secondly, the easiness and cheapness, or the difficulty and expense of learning them; thirdly, the constancy or inconstancy of employment in them; fourthly, the small or great trust which must be reposed in those who exercise them; and, fifthly, the probability or improbability of success in them.

The application of these principles to the work of a college teacher is easy. First; is the work of a college teacher agreeable or disagreeable? I suppose the common testimony would be that it is agreeable. It represents a pleasant physical environment. It stands for the charm of personal companionship of the best men. It is a happiness to be with students. One's own colleagues represent the finest type of the gentleman. The work of the college teacher stands for a search for truth and the conveying of truth, under good conditions, to others. Second; is the learning of the business of a college teacher easy and cheap, or difficult and expensive? The learning is certainly no more

expensive and no more difficult than is the learning to be a lawyer, and is usually less difficult and less expensive than learning to be a physician. The training, however, for becoming a clergyman represents less expense and more ease than becoming a college professor. Third; is employment constant or inconstant? Employment is probably more constant and more certain in a college place than in any other. Many would say that the certainty of employment is too great. Adam Smith has intimated this fact. He has, in a chapter of his great book on the expense of the institutions for the education of youth, lamented that academic teachers are not under a sufficient impulse for making just exertions. Fourth; is the trust reposed in those who exercise academic functions small or great? It is certainly great. Trust is reposed in college teachers in respect to their scholarship. If the scholarship of the teachers be unworthy, the peril is that the scholarly ideas of students will fall, that scholarly methods will be vitiated, that scholarly forces will be weakened and scholarly results put in jeopardy. If those unworthy as men become professors, the peril is that the enthusiasms of students will vanish and the interest of students in highest things be de-

graded. If those who are other than a fine type of the gentleman enter into college places, the peril is that students will fail to respect the professorial office as well as lack a just regard for the men who exercise it. The community reposes so complete a trust in the men who accept college places because they feel assured that the influence of the character of the teacher over the character of the student will be strong and fine, and that the worth of manhood as a formative force in the manhood of youth will be appreciated. Fifth; is success in a college place probable or improbable? Certainly the outlook for success is as probable as it is in any vocation. The certainty of success is as great in a college place as it is in either the ministry, the law, medicine, editorship, or architecture.

On the basis, therefore, of the five principles of Adam Smith, it becomes evident that, with the single exception of one of these principles, the normal salary of a college professorship cannot be high. The work is agreeable, the difficulty of learning it and the attending expense are not relatively great, the constancy of employment is comparatively certain, and success in the service is quite as probable as exists in any other calling. In respect, however, to the trust reposed by the

community in college professors, the conclusion is inevitable that the stipend should correspond to the greatness of this trust. At the present time, the salaries of most college teachers are as high as the salaries of most clergymen of cities or towns in which these colleges are placed. There are, of course, exceptions upon each side. In Cleveland, for instance, salaries are paid to clergymen higher than are paid to any college professor. The higher salaries paid in the University of Chicago are probably about equal to the higher salaries paid to the clergymen of that city. Certain physicians, especially surgeons, receive far larger amounts than are the stipends paid to any college man. The same remark might be made respecting lawyers. But the salaries paid to editors are, on the whole, not so large as those paid to college professors. It would usually, also, I suppose, be acknowledged that there are other elements in the work of an editor not so agreeable as are many parts of college teaching. On the basis, therefore, of Adam Smith's principles, it is hard to make an argument for larger pay for college professors. On the basis of temporary conditions and feelings, of individual needs and relationships, it would be easy to make an argument. But the principles are

permanent, the feelings and conditions are transient. It would, however, be it said, be advantageous for the college place to represent a larger salary, because it would, through a term of years, and in many institutions, be able to command a finer type of man, of the scholar, and of the gentleman. College places should never be so rich as to become objects of avariciousness, but they should be made so fine and noble as to become objects of worthy ambition for human service.

At the present time, in the payment of proper salaries to its professors, the American college is beset by two or three peculiar temptations. One is the desire to put money into buildings and equipment which could be better put in the enlargement and the enrichment of the teaching force. It is far easier for the community to give money to the college to erect halls, libraries, chapels, than to give money for the invisible and less conspicuous service of teaching. The community is learning, and will learn more completely, that it is not the buildings, but the men, who constitute the essential force of an institution for training men.

A second temptation of the college lies in devoting money to administration which should be put

into teaching. The cost of administration in any individual college is in peril of enlarging with each passing year. The cost of administration bears to the college the relation which friction in machinery bears to the machinery itself. The constant endeavor is to lessen waste. But in the college, as in the factory, the cost of doing the business is in peril of increasing by leaps and bounds. A third temptation to which the college is subjected lies in not giving the teachers who command the highest stipends to those classes which have the greatest number of students. The largest class in the college is, usually, the Freshmen. If there be any class which deserves the best teachers and the best teaching, it is this very class. The members of this class pay the most money into the college, and they too frequently get the teachers to whom the college pays the least money.

The men who are worthy of becoming members of the teaching staff of the ideal college, possess certain great characteristics or elements. Among these elements I name these:—largeness of manhood, technical skill in the presentation of their subject, and love for students.

Largeness of manhood represents the noblest qualities of personality:—intellectual wealth, gen-

erosity, faithfulness in service, conscientiousness, appreciation of the highest, all filled with an atmosphere of earnestness. Such qualities are indeed hard to get, and seem especially hard to secure in a materialistic age and nation. But they do represent the ideal, and the ideal every college student seeks to make real in some of his teachers. Every graduate, reading this paragraph, will call up one, two or three teachers of this inspiring type.

A second characteristic of the worthy college teacher lies in his technical fitness to teach. The college professor is in peril of lacking such fitness; he has usually a prejudice against special preparation for performing his art. Normal school training to him is in danger of being a training in the mechanical side of instruction and of character. He believes and believes honestly, that such training develops methods arbitrary and blind, methods at the expense of reality and of substance. But be it said, he is coming to know that such judgments are often prejudices. He is, however, at all events, to know his subject, and to know how to present it, in order to enlarge, to enrich, and to strengthen the manhood of the individual student.

I may be suffered to say that Professor George Herbert Palmer, who has just closed his career at

Harvard College as a teacher of more than forty years, illustrates these elements of the knowing of his subject, and also as possessing the art of a proper presentation of it. He has been a student of philosophy, reading much, interpreting more, reflecting most. If his mind has been rich, his methods have been fine, personal, swift and forcible in their application. He has the art of using his truth to enrich the mind and to give discipline. His discernment produces discernment, and his discretion, discretion. He has vast power of seeing with the student's eyes, of hearing with the ears of the student, and of feeling with the student's heart. His power, in intellectual substitution, is unique. Thousands call him blessed for his helping them to find their best selves.

If the college teacher is to know, to love, and to present truth, he is also, and more, to know and to love his students. He stands in *loco parentis*. The teacher is, in Plato's interpretation, to be a midwife. He is to help unto life; life he is to create, and to life he is to be a beneficent minister. Many men of this type might be named, but I content myself with referring to one, John Bascom. John Bascom served two colleges, Williams as professor, and the University of Wisconsin as

president. A graduate of Williams College has said of him: "Dr. Bascom was always a friend of the students, always willing to help them. You could go to his house—and to go into that house was a benediction anyhow—and he would take out your examination paper and go over it with you question by question, showing you your mistakes. And when he got through you knew about where you stood and he let you think you had hope of graduating after all."

In the ideal college, these three great elements which I have just named should characterize each teacher. The higher the degree in which they are possessed, the more efficient will be the teaching of the college, and the richer the result in the personal character of graduates.

Comprehensively in the ideal college, both on its administrative and pedagogic side, are found at least five supreme elements. They are unity, loyalty, freedom, progressiveness and efficiency.

In unity are included oneness of aim, identity of methods and coöperation of forces. The community of trustees, faculty, students and executive officers should be closely knit together. Separateness and divisions are weaknesses. Jealousies are not to be suffered to arise. All are to possess not

the unity of a machine, but the unity of the tree of life. The unity should prevail, which Jowett intimates in a paragraph in his sermon on Dean Stanley. The master of Balliol says that Stanley "delighted to repeat (as he repeated in this chapel) the familiar story told first by John Wesley, of the old man who went to the gate of heaven, and asked to be admitted as a Wesleyan, but was told in reply that there were no Wesleyans there, nor yet Presbyterians, nor Independents, neither Churchmen nor Dissenters, Protestants nor Catholics, but all one in Christ Jesus."¹⁴

Such unity should characterize the ideal college.

With unity also coexists loyalty—a sense of allegiance to the college whose name every officer bears, and whom all serve. George Eliot once said she noticed that Oxford men criticised each other, and that Cambridge men praised each other. The Cambridge way is better in America; it fosters loyalty. Dean Stanley, to whom I have just referred, used to say that men in college might be in religious opinions as far apart as the poles, but that they could get on well together because they all equally desired the good of their college.¹⁵

¹⁴ "Sermons Biographical and Miscellaneous," by Benjamin Jowett, page 147.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 137-138.

Freedom is also to prevail. Academic freedom possesses a certain talismanic charm. Its invasion often seems to intimate a breaking of collegiate creeds and a breach of good manners. Academic freedom is only a name for the college professor as the embodiment of the gentleman. It means he is free to do and to say what becomes the gentleman. He is set in his place to convey certain truths, to train character by certain recognized methods, and to represent certain high standards of conduct. He is free for, and in the light of, these purposes. He is not free to do or to be the opposite of these aims or conditions. A teacher in a Christian college is not free to teach atheism, or to promote plural marriages, or to foster socialism. A teacher in a reputable American college is said to have said, "The red flag is broader and deeper than the Stars and Stripes or the flag of any other country. The red flag stands for brotherhood, while the flags of other countries stand for war. In so far as it stands for the things that I believe in, I respect the Stars and Stripes; when it does not agree with what I think is right I cannot respect it." A professor who suffers himself thus to speak, is abusing his academic freedom. Col-

lege teachers should have, and do usually have, all the freedom which any gentleman can crave.

The spirit of the ideal college, moreover, represents progressiveness; progressiveness is the embodiment of the forward movement in academic affairs, and the presence of the long look ahead in academic planning. It affirms that the college of to-morrow should be superior to the college of to-day, and that the college of the day following, superior to that of to-morrow. The master of an historic Oxford College said, speaking of a bequest of £100,000, "It is all we want; we could not use another penny." Such conservatism stands for lethargy and promotes death. The American college should always be poor; it should always have needs outrunning its means of supplying them; its course of study should be made richer, the different parts of this course better articulated to each other; its emphases and relationships more fittingly proportioned. Richer achievements in scholarship and nobler teaching should be the constant mood and ambition of teachers. Intensiveness should be characteristic. Such progressiveness is the atmosphere of the good college.

This quartette of elements, unity, loyalty, free-

dom, progressiveness are joined in the great comprehensive word, efficiency. Efficiency is the resultant of the proper coöperation of all the forces working together under happiest conditions, and for the highest aims. Such efficiency characterizes the ideal college. It represents and embodies all its forces.

CHAPTER III

THE STUDENT

THE first thing to be said about a student is that he should be a student and also a thinker. A gentleman of large intellectual power, wealth, of high purpose, and of sympathy with all human interests, said to me recently:—"I have a son in — University. I go to see him pretty often; and while I am visiting him I see a good deal of his friends. I hear them talk about athletics, fraternities, their teachers and the fellows. But I do not hear much talk about their studies. They don't impress me," he added, "as studying much, anyway."

The editor of one of the most popular and useful of American magazines made a remark to me lately to the effect that, in his own college and other similar institutions, he found enthusiasm for football and for base-ball, but he did not find enthusiasm for scholarship.

For one, I believe so thoroughly in athletics and social organizations that I would give them not

only a place but a large place. On the whole I should assent to what my friend, Professor George E. Woodberry, writes me: "I very much appreciate the value of athletics in forming character both in the individual and in the college ideal, and I see very much more clearly the inadequacy of the scholastic training to do the work of forming character in the ways that seem to me most important." For the "scholastic training" alone and unaided is certainly inadequate to form character. The question here, as almost everywhere, is one of proportions. The question is, what use should one make of the four college years in order to insure the highest usefulness in the whole term of seventy years. The question is, what advantage should one take of the manifold opportunities of the college,—so great that he can at the utmost use only a few of them,—in order that life itself shall offer many and rich opportunities and that he shall be able to enter into them with power and the assurance of noble achievements.

I. THE STUDENT'S POINT OF VIEW

In discussing such questions the point of view of the student himself is of primary value. It is the point which the college officer should constantly

occupy, without, of course, any abrogation of his official relations. I have, therefore, asked many students these questions which follow:

1. Do you have any regular plan of work for each day?

2. What hours are most favorable for study each day and what the least?

3. For how many consecutive hours do you find your mind at its best in pursuing: (a) Your favorite study? and (b) Your least pleasant study?

4. How many hours do you study each week, including recitations or lectures?

5. On what studies do you find it easiest to concentrate the attention?

6. Do you find the hour of recitation or lecture as exhaustive as an hour of study in preparation?

7. Do you receive greater advantage from studies in which you are naturally interested or from others?

8. What kinds of food do you find especially promoting or lessening the power of study?

9. What kinds of physical exercise do you find promoting or lessening the power of study?

10. How many hours do you sleep?

11. What books outside of those required have you read since college opened in September?

12. What newspapers or magazines do you read regularly?

13. What work can you do best when tired mentally?

14. Do you find the talk of college students with each other intellectually stimulating?

15. Which is having the greatest influence over you: (a) Your study of a certain subject? (b) Association with college students? (c) The exercises of the class-room?

16. What effect does gymnastic exercise or athletic sport have on the intellectual conditions and habits of the students?

17. How far should other purposes than the intellectual, such as social or æsthetic, prevail in the college life?

It is not worth while to give the answers to each of these questions as they were made by the students of one college; but it is possibly worth while to interpret a few of the more important replies offered to the more important inquiries, as giving intimations of the extent to which scholastic or similar conditions obtain in the college. Most students do have a plan for the work of each day, and the harder their work the more carefully made is their plan. The range of the number of

hours spent in study each week, including recitations and lectures, is from forty-two to sixty-two.

Professor Edwin H. Hall, in 1900, sent to a representative number of the students of each of the four classes of Harvard College an inquiry asking in essence how many hours a week each man studied. The answers showed that thirty-five hours a week represented the time spent by the average man on his regular scholastic work. The largest number of hours was spent by the Freshman, slightly more than thirty-nine, and the smallest by the Sophomore, slightly more than thirty-one. Between thirty-three and thirty-four hours were spent by the Juniors and Seniors. Of course, the extreme showed a wide difference: one Senior reported spending sixty-seven hours a week on his studies, and one seventeen!

"These figures go far to show," says Professor Hall, "at least, that the Harvard undergraduate is not the arrant idler he is sometimes supposed to be."¹ The inference is, of course, sound.

The conclusions gathered from all these investigations indicate that the American college student studies, studies *somewhat*; but I believe they do not indicate that he is a *hard* worker. They point

¹ *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, March, 1901, page 332.

to the conclusion that college students are simply a part of the general community: some of them work hard, and a few very hard; some do not work hard, and a few work very little; and most do not work harder than is necessary to keep a reputable standing in the college community. But relatively I believe the ordinary college man works harder than does the ordinary merchant or manufacturer. But, on the whole, he ought to work a good deal more than he does.

Each student should have, as he usually does have, a plan for the best use of the twenty-four hours of each day. I should regard the following outline as a type, which the individual should adjust to his own needs:—

To study	9 hours
To exercise	1 or 2 hours
To sleep	8 hours
To meals	2 hours
To fun	4 or 3 hours

24 hours

In using such a plan, students are tempted to cut down the hours of sleep, and also not to spend a proper time at their meals; temptations which

may result in all sorts of nervous disorders. Nine hours are a longer time than some students should spend in study, especially if they study in earnestness and absorption. But never should less than an hour a day be given to exercise nor less than three to the fun of talk and of association with the fellows.

The general reading done by most students is very slight. The majority of college students in America do not read a half dozen serious books in the course of the college year, which are not required or recommended by their teachers as directly contributing to their studies. Novels are, of course, read more than other books, but they are read little. But though students read few books, they do read the current periodicals. There is probably far less of general reading and far more of reading of magazines than forty years ago. The reason is largely that the college courses have themselves become more vital, more interesting, more satisfying to the intellectual demands, and that the magazines are also more timely as well as far more numerous.

To the question whether the ordinary talk of students with each other is "intellectually stimulating" are returned answers, which, with a single ex-

ception, are such as I believe the "looker-on in Venice" would find surprisingly sad. The answers are *No*. And yet some qualifications or exceptions should be added. One writes: "At times one catches a whiff of intellectual conversation which is mentally refreshing." Another says: "After several hours of hard work, one does not feel inclined to talk on deep subjects; and, indeed, I do not think one ought to. There is a great deal of light harmless talk and little meaningless pleasantry, but there is also a great temptation to 'gossip' to which we too often yield." A third says: "The talk of a number of students together I have seldom found 'intellectually stimulating'; but I believe it to be the exception when two or three students talk together and the result is not advantageous to one or all." One college boy explains this lack of good talk by the remark that the fellows "know each other too well." But he adds, "If one is so fortunate as to be acquainted with recent college graduates he will find in them a great stimulus."

The reflective observer will not be at all surprised at the tenor of these replies. For how often outside of college walls does one hear conversation which is an intellectual stimulus? Al-

though talk is humanity's constant and supreme amusement, yet good talk represents such a force of intellectual sympathy and of personal substitution, such a power of availing oneself of one's intellectual resources at sight, and in fact presupposes having intellectual resources, that one cannot in justice to oneself, not to say anything about justice to one's companions, expect that the talk of college students shall be bright, wise, vital, good. The ordinary talk is not intellectually stimulating; but I dare say that the talk of college students is more remote from intellectual dullness and stupidity than usually obtains.

The question of what influences are more formative in the college is a question in which the personal equation plays a specially significant part. It is a question, too, which would receive different answers in different colleges as well as in the case of different individuals. The students, who have answered the questions proposed, on the whole believe that their study of a subject has proved of more worth to them than the exercises of the class-room, and also believe that the exercises of the class-room have proved of more value than association with their classmates. Such an answer indicates that the intellectual accent and emphasis

have been more significant than the ethical, the executive or the personal. But if I were to ask this question of the students of Yale, I am confident in a confidence based on answers made to the same essential questions, already asked, by Yale graduates, that the common answer would be that one's classmates and other associates do more for one than all other personalities and forces. Life makes life, character forms character. But I may add that the study of an important subject made by a student *should* have a stronger influence in the forming of his manhood than any other force. The twenty-five or thirty hours at least of a week which the student spends, or should spend, alone, in reading great books or in reflection on great subjects, ought to represent a power mightier than the class-room expositions of teachers or the after-dinner talk of companions, in the formation of character.

It may be said, in general, that college students, in common with college professors, believe that college life should be primarily intellectual. Social relations, æsthetic appreciations, athletic opportunities, religious affiliations, are not to be neglected. Their place they have, and each student should seek to put them in their place.

One writes: "The intellectual side should be first in the mind of the college man. The social and æsthetic should be used to the best advantage in supplementing the former." Another says: "The social and æsthetic should be equal or nearly equal to the intellectual. Certainly those who devote their entire time to intellectual purposes, as many do, do not graduate so well equipped for life as those who, during their college course, have given more time to the social and æsthetic sides of college life." But the man or woman who, coming forth from the four years of college, is not able to think, to judge, to weigh evidence, to assess facts at a proper value, to appreciate the relative worth of truths, has missed—whatever else he may have gained—a primary purpose of the college. This purpose is constitutive of other purposes. Daniel Webster in his autobiography, writing of some college addresses which he made, says: "I had not then learned that all true power in writing is in the idea, and not in the style." Likewise the single formative power of the college is intellectual. For most men a failure at this point of the college course is a failure along the whole line of attainment. I do not mean, of course, that the whole character and being of each man is not more im-

portant, far more important, than the intellectual conditions and relations. But I do mean that if the intellectual conditions and relations be unsatisfactory, the college has failed to do a work which it should have done in the making of the whole character and being. Let the student be taught to decline *virtus* and to conjugate *amo* so accurately that his whole manhood shall be made strong and his whole heart big in love and sympathy for all men. Intellectual training is at once an end and a means. In the history of the individual, as of humanity, an intellectual new birth is in itself light, and also points the way to the formation or the reformation of the will and of the whole character.

II. TO BE A THINKER

It is important for the student to be a student; it is more important for him to be a thinker. Thinking and studying hold intimate relations. All studying represents, or should represent, thinking; but thinking may not represent studying. Thinking is far more subjective than studying. Thinking is the application of the mind to a problem, a condition, a situation. Reasoning, judging, weighing evidence, comparing, relating, inferring, are its products. It stands for intellectual initia-

tive. It represents mental inquisitiveness, investigation, searching, and sometimes discovery. It is science finding a law in the observation and comparing of phenomena. It is analysis,—the separation of complex and perplexing conditions. It is synthesis,—putting together things which are separated and putting them together as they are related.

Thinking is work. It is hard work, if it be hard thinking. The hardness of the work bears a direct proportion to the hardness of the thinking. To such work the college man is summoned. The knowledge which the student gains, the facts which he acquires, the scholarship of which he becomes the master, rich as the results are, are of slight value in comparison with the worth of the power of thinking. Knowledge represents acquisitiveness; thinking, inquisitiveness. Knowledge represents the store-house; thinking, the engine; knowledge, accumulation; thinking, efficiency. Knowledge may, or may not, be power; thinking is, and always is, power. The man who knows represents the receiving, the piling up, and the hoarding of truths. The man who thinks represents intellectual activity, alertness, responsiveness. Such service is labor.

There is some reason to believe that college men are becoming, as a class, less eager to undertake and to carry forward constantly and earnestly, such labor. In undertaking any such interpretation lies a peril of becoming a mere *laudator temporis acti*. But after making proper deductions for such personal limitations, there does exist a feeling that students are not so willing to think as once they were. Such a belief is certainly widespread, and is held by some creditable witnesses.

In a paper read before the Schoolmasters' Association of New York and vicinity on "The Mind of the Undergraduate," Professor George P. Baker said: "As I work with these undergraduates I am more and more surprised to find, not that they do not know how to think accurately, cogently (I suppose they would not be in classes in argumentation if they knew how to think well), but that many of them have no real interest in knowing how to think well. Many of them mean to enter the Law School and therefore wish training in debate. Many suspect that some day they will have to speak often in public and wish the requisite training. Far too many of both groups desire the end but care nothing for the means, the process by which it may best be attained. It is only by forcing, coaxing, that

one can develop in these youths any interest in thinking for thinking's own sake, can make them appreciate the fact that there is a delicate pleasure in the process of thinking." "Clad in intellectual oilskins, he (the student) is almost blithesome in his absolute imperviousness to the ideas for which he is supposed to be taking the course."²

A distinguished teacher at one of the more conspicuous historic colleges writes me saying, "I believe that the thinking power of students and their willingness to undertake hard tasks has distinctly lessened in the last ten years. The food the student now gets is poured into him 'predigested.' He no longer tears off, chews, masticates, and deglutinates his food,—he simply bolts it. It is often administered in sugar-coated pills, or gelatinous capsules. That is what the average student prefers, and therefore that is what he gets, since he must get what he wants. When, therefore, he is called upon for any of the sturdy old processes of mastery, he is apt to bolt or balk,—even the best of him. All this is just as true in Germany, as my friends there assured me, as in America. But there the 'Staatsexamen' serves to moderate the evil." Another teacher, also in an historic college,

² *Educational Review* for September, 1905, Vol. 30, page 189.

expresses the same conviction, and adds, "I have often spoken of this to my colleagues and many, perhaps most of them, agree with me."

A teacher who has, for thirty years, been a beloved and efficient member of one of the smaller denominational, but efficient, colleges of the Central West, and who has, in this time, served as librarian, says: "I have been librarian for thirty years and have had to do with the whole college. I have of necessity observed somewhat their (students) mental habits. My opinion is that in library consultations an increasing number of students use library helps more and more, and do as little thinking as possible. They are frank in saying, 'I don't like this subject; there is so little reading upon it.' Again and again I say to them, 'It is a good theme. You can do your own thinking.' I am confirmed in this view by one of my colleagues of the Faculty, who has served on a committee to select questions for prize debates in one of our societies. He says the committee have chosen questions purposely that required thinking rather than reading, and have been criticised by the speakers for so doing. These conditions are fostered by two obvious things. The lecture system requires note-books and note-taking. In library work it has degenerated into

literal copying from the open book. That process is constantly going on under the eyes of the librarian. Again, library helps have greatly multiplied in the last twenty-five years. They unlock everything and make the work easy for the searcher. They are invaluable to the advanced scholar who has learned to do his own thinking. But like all sharp-edged tools, they are dangerous in the hands of the novice."

Conferences which I hold with college men in many parts, commonly, although not universally, lead to a similar conclusion. Occasionally I hear the remark made that there is no deterioration in the intellectual power or work of students. Another expresses the conviction that any judgment touching any apparent deterioration arises from the change in the point of view of the one judging. A teacher of philosophy in a small and good college says: "I have never had better students than last year. I believe I require as much now as I ever did, and get as much done." Yet, such judgments are rather exceptional. The trend of conviction is that students are less inclined to think and less willing to undertake hard tasks than they formerly were. This conclusion is not by any means proved, but the evidence for the conclusion is such as to

cause anyone interested in American life or American education to become somewhat solicitous.

An inquiry into the causes of this condition bears one into both general and academic relations. The causes may reach back into the fitting school. But this cause also has relations to demands made by the college upon the fitting school. Most colleges build a high gate-way of entrance. To open this gate represents a knowledge and a kind of knowledge which, in many respects, does not promote the gaining of thinking power. As Professor Baker has said in addition, "I sometimes wonder . . . whether it is possible that the colleges have set such rigid standards for the various entrance examinations that the schools must give all their time to cramming the boys for them, and cannot teach them to see the relation or bearing of one subject upon another. If, instead, the boy came up to college with fewer facts, but an interest in thinking for its own sake, respect for learning and literature, and some responsibility in citizenship, would not the gain be great? The schools now send him up with his mind like a desk with pigeon holes, some of them perhaps a trifle dusty, but undoubtedly with contents, yet not as a human being who has a relation to learning, literature, and the facts

of existence, and who is able and eager to make for himself applications of the ideas he has learned.”³ Are not the colleges in peril of sacrificing the intellectual power of thinking to the intellectual power of gaining facts for the passing of examinations? There are, there have been, masters of fitting schools who made their boys thinkers. Samuel H. Taylor of Andover was of this type. He did not have a high place in fitting boys to pass well the examinations for admission to the Freshman class in Harvard College; but the training in thinking which he fostered did emerge in the exceptional intellectual power of his men when they came to enter into the Junior or Senior year.

One cause, too, may be found to lie in the increasing luxuriousness of academic life. The luxuriousness of academic life increases with the luxuriousness of life without college walls. Of the fact of the increase of luxury of both types there can be no manner of questioning. This condition is not to be anathematized for the present purpose, it is to be only interpreted. A luxurious life is certainly, in many respects, to be preferred to a life bare and becoming barren. If barrenness and limitation are in peril of producing cynicism,

³ *Educational Review* for September, 1905, Vol. 30, pp. 198-9.

moral ruthlessness, contempt of the civilities,—as they are,—so luxuriousness is in peril of producing in the student softness of intellectual and ethical fiber, flabbiness, indolence, and a preference of the passive graces for the active virtues. The use and enjoyment of material luxuries are consuming intellectual force which otherwise might be devoted to scholastic affairs.

It is not, moreover, for one instant to be questioned but that the great interest of the undergraduates in athletic concerns does tend to draw away their interest from concerns directly intellectual. College talk is not, on the whole, as I have intimated, intellectually stimulating, and the talk which prevails in the first two months of each academic year is very remote from intellectual stimulation. This talk concerns the great American college game. The colleges have been inclined to go mad about football. Professionalism,—if not of money, at least of method,—has come to possess the under-graduate mind. For, as a conspicuous professor in a conspicuous college has written: “An athletic ‘career’ at one of our great universities now is essentially a professional career. A ‘husky’ young fellow may go through an academy on the strength of his athletic prowess, then come

to Yale or Harvard and be carried through his university course on the strength of the same prowess, accumulating money as he goes, and then find some choice instructorship awaiting him in a great preparatory school, and then the vicious circle is complete, and he trains up other 'husky' fellows to come to the universities and do just what he has done. But such men are not amateurs, they are professionals, as I hold, reaping pecuniary reward all the time for their athletic proficiency, and reaching a proficiency far beyond the reach of anyone who is not ready to make a profession out of his athletics. They get a magnificent training, I do not for a moment doubt, a training which our other professional schools may well envy for its minute thoroughness and its fine perfection of the best traditions, but the training is not along scholarly lines. I believe that Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Pennsylvania, and other large universities, now furnish and maintain, with the assistance of a paying public, large and thorough professional schools of athletics."

Under such a condition, intellectual fires burn low on the altars of scholarship and of thoughtfulness.

Another cause may lie in the use made of the

elective system of studies. The advantages offered through the elective system are very great. The introduction of this system was inevitable. But, despite its inevitableness and its advantages, disadvantages do accompany its use. Among the advantages, be it said, is the promotion of scholarship. It has lifted scholastic standards. It has permitted the development of departments of study beyond the elements of a subject. It has promoted the growth of individuality in personal character, as well as in scholarship. But, under this very condition, it has also allowed the development of character through less strenuous subjects and methods unto less worthy results. It has suffered the student to make for himself a curriculum through which he is not obliged to run, but may dawdle and amble. If, for certain men, it has promoted strenuousness, in others it has promoted softness. If it has allowed not a few men to make the most of themselves and more than they could under any other system, it has also allowed a few, at least, to make the less, and possibly the least of themselves. Yet it might be affirmed that it is better for a man to select for himself a soft course than to suffer the imposition of a hard course against which he would rebel. But this, at least,

is clear, that for some men the effect of an easy-going system is a neglect of the intellectual severities and virilities.

A fifth cause of the condition emerges. The coming to the college of men who propose, upon leaving college, to enter business, has been the occasion of congratulation for both the commercial and the academic world. The reflex action, however, of the presence in the college of many men who propose to follow commercial or industrial pursuits needs to be considered well. Such men often represent a high social type and are also of more than average financial ability. They go to college because of their desire for the "touch" of college life. Specific reasons sometimes also influence. Associations formed in college, they are inclined to believe, may open good business opportunities. Domestic or social conditions frequently prompt to the entering into academic relations. But it is also clear that the scholastic impulse, or the scholarly motive, is not primary. Intellectual purposes do not dominate. Executive functions, undergraduate undertakings,—athletic, literary, social,—are regarded as securing the purpose of coming to college quite as completely as hard reading or high thinking. The conclusion is inevitable.

Such men are not naturally or usually interested in hard reading and high thinking.

I am also inclined to believe that the transfer of interest on the part of the teacher, away from the personality of the student, to the subject of his own studies, may promote the result of the student neglecting the duty of thinking. The teachers of the earlier time were feeble enough in many respects. They knew little of truth. They were not scholars. Their regard for the student was certainly great yet not too great. The teachers of the present time possess an equipment in knowledge much superior to that possessed by the teacher of the earlier period. But their interest in the students is, on the whole, not so great. They are more inclined to regard their work as finished at the close of the recitation or of the lecture. They are in peril of neglecting what some regard as a duty,—the aiding of the individual student. For such a result they are not wholly to be blamed. The increasing size of classes, the elaborateness of living, the augmentation of executive work, the opportunity of research, represent functions which, not a few of them worthily hold, are more important than the concern for the individual man. But, at all events, the individual man, as a thinking and

moral being, is in peril of suffering. He does not grow. In many instances he does suffer.

One may ask the question—what is to be done?

It is something to know that a peril exists. The knowledge of its existence is the first condition for its removal. The Anglo-Saxon man, too, even if he be a college man, has the primary power of self-correction.

It is important, moreover, for college teachers to promote the pursuit, on the part of their students, of such subjects as, in their inherent character, demand thinking, and also to promote such a pursuit of these subjects as does promote thinking. Mathematics is a subject which demands thinking. It is thinking; it is nothing else. History may be presented as a matter of acquisition; it also may be presented as a matter of weighing evidence, as a study of cause and effect. Economics is a subject which specially offers opportunities for such a study as develops thinking. Its phenomena are complex, and the causes which prevail in its field are often obscure. These studies, and similar ones, offer a special advantage in creating and nourishing the power of thinking.

It also should be borne in mind that, in the loyalty for the elective system of studies, there is to

be loyalty to a *system of study*. The studies may be elective; study is not. If the student will not study, he is to be excluded from the place of study. The community is demanding that the college man shall "make good." The community suffers a sense of disgust at academic laziness. The community is becoming impatient, not only of tomfoolery, of horse-play, and of nonsense, but also of inefficiency. The community demands that the college man shall work at his job, and the community realizes that the most important part of his job is to think. Can college officers do better than to seek to meet the righteous demand of the community that students shall attend to the great business of thinking?

As a result of hard studying and harder thinking, the man in college often attains a first-rate rank. As a result of his obtaining a first-rate rank, he can give to himself the promise of attaining high distinction in his life's work. The common impression that first scholars do not become first men is false. In evidence of the fact that first scholars do usually become first men, I wish to give some facts.

The eminent historian and biographer, William Roscoe Thayer, has made a list of the first ten

scholars of each of the Harvard classes that graduated in the sixth decade of the last century. In the statement are included a few men ranking lower than tenth who subsequently became distinguished. The list is itself significant as regards individuals. The list is more significant in respect to high rank in college giving ground for assurance of distinction in the work done after college.

In the class of 1850 were James C. Carter, of New York, frequently called a leader of the bar in this country, and Joseph H. Thayer, the eminent scholar in New Testament Greek. Carter was fourth and Thayer was third in a class of sixty-five members. The second scholar of the class of 1851 was W. W. Goodwin, one of the most distinguished students and teachers of Greek of the last fifty years. The fourth scholar of the class of 1852, of eighty-seven members, was Joseph H. Choate, ambassador at the Court of St. James. The second scholar of the class of 1853 of eighty-eight members, was President Eliot. The most distinguished man, without doubt, in the class of 1854 was Horace H. Furness, the great Shakespearean editor and scholar, who was fifth on the rank-list. In the class of 1855, of eighty-one members, the first two scholars were Francis C. Bar-

low, the New York lawyer and a major general, and Robert Treat Paine, the Boston philanthropist. The eighth scholar was F. B. Sanborn, author and publicist, and the fourteenth, be it said, Phillips Brooks. In the first ten of the class of 1856, of ninety members, are found the names of Greenough, the teacher of Latin, of Searle, the astronomer, of Robinson, the Governor of Massachusetts, and of Jeremiah Smith, of the Supreme Court of New Hampshire, and professor in the Harvard Law School. The fourth scholar of the next class, of 1857, was John D. Long, Secretary of the Navy, Member of Congress, Governor of Massachusetts. In the class of 1858 are found the names of Wentworth, and Cilley, teachers in Phillips Academy, and of Hartwell, justice of the Supreme Court and attorney general of Hawaii. The class of 1859 had for its third scholar William Everett, Member of Congress, principal of Adams Academy, and among the first ten were Albert Stickney and John C. Gray, lawyers of New York and Boston, and Alexander McKenzie, the Cambridge preacher.

In the whole number are found two members of cabinets, five congressmen, five judges, two governors of states, and one ambassador. Also in the

list is found a good number of those who have served as teachers at Harvard and other colleges.⁴

Similar testimony is furnished by the annals of Yale College. Among the first scholars of its classes for a hundred years are Professor Ralph Emerson (1811) of Andover; President Theodore Dwight Woolsey (1820); Governor Henry B. Harrison (1846); Professor Henry Hamilton Hadley (1847); Judge Dwight Foster (1848); President Franklin W. Fisk (1849); President Martin Kellogg (1850); five successive valedictorians thus reaching eminence; Professor Addison Van Name (1858); Professor Tracy Peck (1861); Leander T. Chamberlain (1863); Hon. F. N. Judson (1866); Dean Henry Parks Wright (1868), and President Arthur T. Hadley (1876). On the list of salutatorians are President F. A. P. Barnard (1828); Rev. Joseph T. Thompson (1838); Judge William L. Learned (1841); Professor James Hadley (1842); President Timothy Dwight (1849); Judge—now governor of Connecticut—Simeon E. Baldwin (1861); Professor C. G. Smith (1865); Professor G. F. Moore (1872), and William H. Taft (1878), President of the United States.

⁴ *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, Vol. 12, pages 200-06.

The practically complete list of valedictorians and salutatorians of Yale shows that about fifty-six per cent. of the number have "won success" and honorable distinction, including one President of the United States, thirteen college presidents, five judges of higher courts and forty-five professors of universities and colleges.

The evidence thus offered could be vastly enlarged. The conclusion is inevitable that men who are the leaders in scholarship become the leaders in the great undertakings of life to which they give their trained minds.

The student coming to college finds himself a member of a little monarchy, more or less limited or more or less absolute, or a citizen of a republic. The monarchical system of college control is passing away. The system of self-government is coming in. This system represents one of the more important developments of the last decades and also one of the important elements of the life of the college student at the present time.

Sir Henry Maine closes an important chapter of his "Ancient Law" with the remark, "If, then, we employ status, agreeably with the usage of the best writers, to signify these personal conditions only, and avoid applying the term to such condi-

tions as are the immediate or remote result of agreement, we may say that the movement of the progressive societies has hitherto been a movement from *Status to Contract*.”⁵ Following out the analogy of Sir Henry, it may be said the movement in the government of college students “has hitherto been a movement from *Status to Contract*.” It has been a movement from a condition in which the student was regarded somewhat as woman was regarded by the ancient law, as the subject of whatever disability or ability her father or husband might impose, to a state in which the student is looked upon as a person capable of making and of keeping a contract. It has been a movement from a condition in which he was obliged to obey certain rules, often many and petty, in the making of which he had no voice, to a condition in which he has some influence in the forming of regulations which he is supposed to respect.

In the early period the college government was a transcript of the colonial. It was strict, autocratic, and descended to trivial details. It recognized the social distinction of families. Students were seated in their classes according to the rank of their fathers. If the young brother was at

⁵ *Ancient Law*,” by Henry Sumner Maine, Chapter V. page 165.

home the servant of the elder, so at college was the freshman the "fag" of an upper classman; if an upper classman chanced to be in the presence of a freshman, the freshman was obliged to prove his inferiority, as by standing uncovered. The early practice at Harvard was to administer discipline by means of corporal punishment. "The delinquent kneeled, in the presence of the president, who superintended the person executing the discipline, and began and ended the chastisement with prayer."⁶ "Boxing" also long continued to be a favorite method. It was a right regarded so essential to discipline that the exercise of it was expressly reserved to the president, professors and tutors. Among the rules of 1650 was one forbidding the use of that noxious weed, tobacco, "unless permitted by the president, and the consent of parents and guardians, and a good reason first given by a physician." Fines were also imposed for many offenses, as absence from or tardiness at college exercises. In the middle of the eighteenth century at Harvard College no less than fifty-two such offenses were recognized. "Absence from prayers" cost two pence; "absence from public worship," nine; "going to

⁶ Quincy's "History Harvard University," Vol. II, page 134.

meeting before bell-ringing," six. The mulct for "frequenting taverns" was not to exceed one shilling and sixpence, nor was that for "profane cursing" to be more than two shillings and sixpence; for playing cards undergraduates might be fined two and sixpence, but graduates guilty of this serious misdemeanor might be obliged to pay twice this sum. Either "lying" or "drunkenness" was charged one shilling and sixpence; "tumultuous noises" cost the same as "lying," and "rudeness at meals" was valued at one shilling.⁷

The rules, however, proclaimed for the control of students were often not so petty or ill-timed as were the personal attempts of officers to enforce discipline. College rebellions, like civil, have usually sprung from some overt act of the governing power. In 1802, President Fitch, of Williams College, wrote: "We have lately had trouble in College. The judgments we drew up and published to the classes respecting their examinations in March gave offense. Three classes in succession were in a state of insurrection against the government of the college. For ten days we had a good deal of difficulty; but the faculty stood firm, and determined to give up no right. At last, without

⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pages 499-500.

the loss of a single member, all were reduced to due obedience and subordination.”⁸ All college rebellions have not ended so happily in reducing the students “to due obedience and subordination.” Six years later, in 1808, the Williams students petitioned the faculty for the removal of certain tutors. The faculty not only refused to grant the request, but also determined to make the petitioners acknowledge that they had done wrong in presenting it, and to exact a promise that the offense should not be repeated. Such an attempt was the height of folly. Intense excitement prevailed. At last the president acknowledged that he had been misinformed regarding the matter, and that the attempt should be abandoned. Thereupon the faculty, with the exception of its head, resigned; and, unlike the result in the typical college rebellion, the professors and tutors, instead of the students, went home, and their chairs were filled with new teachers. At the present time it is probable that no endeavor so completely foolish would be made in a single one of our six hundred colleges.

The difficulties in the governing of students have not, however, passed away with the disappearance of the status of the last two centuries. These diffi-

⁸ Durfee's "History of Williams College," pages 85-6.

culties inhere in the very nature of students, and in the relations in which they are placed. Students are of an age which brooks restraints with an ill grace. They are removed from the sphere of the gentle admonitions, as well as of the firm rule, of the home. They realize the rights of early manhood with keen vividness, and but dimly its duties and responsibilities. They are conscious of their dawning intellectual and moral power, and failure has not taught them the limitations of this power. They are in association with hundreds or thousands—an inflammable body to which each contributes the fuel of his own vigorous nature. They are somewhat inclined, although less than formerly, to regard the authorities with suspicion, if not with positive dislike. They are peculiarly sensitive to any methods suggestive of official espionage. They believe the old political principle that “the best government is that which governs the least.”

It needs no very wide opportunity of observation to affirm that the method of government usually pursued in colleges for such men has not proved to be successful. Despite the intellectual and moral character of college authorities, representing the noblest scholarship, the best culture, and often the most distinguished capacities for administration,

the difficulties have proved too great. One need not cite as evidence the failure to suppress such petty disorders as the lighter forms of hazing. Evidence of a more substantial sort is not lacking. Every year occur revolts of students against their rulers. Two years ago it was a conservative and distinguished college like —— which was the scene of a rebellion. Last year it was —— in which the students, stung by what they regarded as an affront to the memory of a former president, retired from the college, and in their action received, it is said, the support of their parents. Another year it is a noble college like —— that is in a tumult. The students aroused by an alleged “widespread espionage exercised throughout the college and town,” and by “an arduous system of examinations,” held a mass meeting, and issued an address to the trustees as well as a circular letter. Thus the explosion occurs in several colleges each year. It may be some trick which the Sophomores play on the Freshmen. It may be a plot to “blow up” a college building, such as was put into execution at a historic college several years ago. It may be a “cane rush” or a “rope-pull,” at times friendly enough, and at times harmless enough, and at times also anything but friendly

and harmless, when broken limbs and sprained joints bear witness to the ferocity of the struggle. These facts indicate that the monarchical methods of college government are a failure.

The comparative failure, therefore, of "parental government" suggests the question—What form of government should be maintained in our colleges? Two answers are possible:

In the first place, the college may abdicate all attempt at the personal supervision of students. Officers and professors may affirm that their duties to their students are ended when they have offered instruction, provided libraries, and other opportunities of intellectual culture. They may declare themselves to be simply forces for teaching and examining, and not moralists or police officers. This interpretation, of course, prevails in German universities. A Halle professor remarked to the president of an American college: "The professors assume no responsibility for the personal character or behavior of students." The result of the German method is not altogether satisfactory. The experience of the colleges on the other side of the Atlantic does not encourage the colleges on this side to surrender all attempts at exercising personal supervision or control over their students.

The second answer to the proposed question lies in the field of a democratic form of college government. Is it not possible to displace the monarchical method, and the "parental" fiction by some form of self-government? Is it not possible to make some form of self-government pleasant to students, and satisfactory in the view of professors? I venture to believe that in this democratic method lies a great hope for our colleges. Its value is no longer a question of theory merely; its value is already somewhat determined by experience.

Although the direct purpose of every college is the promotion of the welfare of the students, and not the cultivation of the leisure of the professors, yet the democratic system tends to relieve the faculty of many harassing cares and perplexities. Every president and officer knows too well the amount of time, and of physical and intellectual energy consumed in the administration of discipline. This department is one which, if not demanding so much time as that of instruction, does occasion much more anxiety. To avoid all occasions of disorder, to settle satisfactorily whatever disorders may have broken out, are duties to which every faculty is obliged at times to devote pro-

longed attention. The tendency of the democratic method is to transfer these burdens from the officers to the students; and upon the shoulders of the students, be it said, they do not rest with a weight heavier than their essential importance represents.

A further advantage of student government lies in the fact that the method is an excellent training for citizenship and other public service. The problems of a body of students are the problems of the community. The meeting of the difficulties academic prepares the way for the meeting and overcoming the difficulties which lie outside college walls.

A constant danger to which the system is subject lies in the possibility of a decline in its efficiency. The enthusiasm with which its adoption is greeted may disappear with the increase of its duties. As in any scheme, also, the officers may fail to prove themselves worthy. But these perils, experience indicates, may be avoided. The president of a university which adopted the democratic method says: "The increase of offenses has soon aroused the sleeping energy of the youthful rulers; or, if still apathetic, the hints of their constituents have admonished them of their duty. The faculty have also watched over the progress of affairs; and the

regent, by a timely chapel talk, has, when necessary, reënforced the government by recalling the minds of all to the serious character of the experiment, and to the supreme importance of their work."

The general condition for the adoption of some scheme of this nature lies in the success of the attempt to unite the best classes of students in its support. If it is impossible to unite the best men the scheme is a preordained failure. If they can be thus united, its success is assured. In this respect the democratic system in the college is like the democratic system in civil society. Its worth depends upon the interest of the individuals of the best character. But that the ablest students do thus unite with great willingness is the testimony of those colleges into which the system has been introduced. It is not to be questioned also but that the advantages of this method and the evils of the old method are both so great that the students who have at heart the welfare and reputation of the college are glad to join hands in the support of the scheme.

It may be asked whether the plan is as applicable to a college with a large number of students as to a college with a small number. It may

indeed be beset with certain difficulties in Harvard with two thousand students, from which it is free in Amherst with five hundred. Offenses cannot in so wide a field be detected with ease. The individual offending becomes lost in the large body; the personal influence of student over student is less. These disadvantages might perhaps, in case experience proved their force in any individual college, be removed by allowing each class to have a governing system of its own. This method would give to the large college the same advantages which the small college enjoys.

But, even should no elaborate system be introduced, every college faculty may fittingly ask its students to appoint a representative committee of their number, with whom it may consult upon all matters of common interest. The students of every college would gladly avail themselves of such a privilege. The members of the committee might hold their position for a college term, or a year. Such mutual consultations would be of advantage to both parties. They would be the means of communicating to the officers the desires of the students. They would prove to the students the difficulties under which a college labors in much of its administration. They would tend to promote a

sympathy between officers and students which would be of value to each.

It is more than probable that along this line of the consultation of the faculty with representative committees of the students will the endeavor for some sort of a democratic system be made in most colleges. This method is so simple that it can be applied without the setting up of any elaborate machinery. It is as satisfactory to students as it is honorable to officers.

The self-governing system is a great help, as I have intimated, in putting down definite college disorders; but be it said, college disorderliness is a condition always to be interpreted in a large way. For it is a symptom quite as much as a fact.

The first method and, in many ways, the most useful, for the suppression of disorderliness relates to the appreciation by the college faculty of the general conditions of the students themselves. It consists in the officer putting himself in the place of the student. Students do not possess all the wisdom that they think they have. Perhaps in this respect they are not altogether unlike other parts of the community; yet, they do have a good deal of wisdom. Mr. Lowell is reported to have said, and the remark is, I think, in part bor-

rowed from Sydney Smith, that "Cambridge is the wisest place in the world, for the Freshmen come up bearing stacks of wisdom, and the Seniors never carry any away." But, at all events, while the men are in Cambridge, or in any other college town, not only do they think themselves to be wise, but I also, as a college president, believe that they have so much wisdom that it deserves appreciative attention. The point of view which the student mind occupies is one which the college professor and the president should seek to understand. He is not at all to be in the mood of a certain late Bishop of London of our own time, who, it was said, had three remarks to make to each caller. The first was "What's your name?" The second, "What do you want?" The third and last, "No." If college presidents of this type have in the past been successful, they are successful no longer. It was said of one of them, no longer living, by one of the graduates of the college which he served, that "he would make a first-rate college president, if he could have three men to chew up every morning before breakfast." The great college presidents and governing authorities of the present and, I believe, of the future, are men who can put themselves in the students'

place, hear with the students' ears, see with the students' eyes, and appreciate with the students' mind.

In this general appreciation on the part of the governing authorities, intellectual sympathy and discrimination play a large part. The individual student or body of students, inclined to rebelliousness or disorderliness, are in each case to be asked to state their desire with accuracy and fullness. The mere attempt to make such a statement not infrequently proves how slight is the thing desired, and how easy it is to make the change requested. Not a few requests of students can in essence be properly granted, though the form, or certain incidental elements of the request, cannot be suffered. Discrimination promotes settlement of difficulties. This was the method employed by President Mark Hopkins in the putting down of the rebellion of Williams College of 1868. He pointed out to the students what was tenable, and what untenable, in their position. He made it clear to them that they could not dissolve their association with Williams College. He also declared that the faculty, and not the students, governed, that any combination on the part of the students against the faculty was contradictory to the pledge which each man made

on matriculation. I also believe that, through personal interviews, Dr. Hopkins assured all students that in a certain personal independence of each man's manhood he thoroughly sympathized. Under his firm and kindly, as well as wise, interpretation, the rebellion ended, and the spirit of rebelliousness ceased.

In a college, which I know well, and certainly love much, is what is known as the Step Ceremony among its traditions. The Sophomore class of each year is supposed to be the guardian of the steps of one of the great halls. At the beginning of each new year, the incoming Junior class hands over by a certain form, these steps to the incoming Sophomore class. Formerly, and for a brief time, Freshmen had sought to occupy these seats. On one occasion the Freshmen made a combined attack upon Sophomores occupying them. The condition was more or less of a personal fight, and of course could not be suffered. The president of the college called together the men concerned. He pointed out the dangers involved. On his suggestion a somewhat formal ceremony of a speech of delivery and of a speech of acceptance, together with some wrestling matches between selected members of the Freshmen and

Sophomore classes, was easily substituted for the pell-mell scrimmage. The result was accomplished simply through this plan of quiet discrimination and sympathizing.

In making all such adjustments, the heart, it is never to be forgotten, has a place. The lack of heart is rather disastrous, both in mood and in specific acts. I recall the case of a student who was one of a combination against college authority. The combination was broken up. No moral elements entered into the conditions. Many of the members of the cabal had been reinstated. One member returned to the college of a morning, and sought out the president. The president received him gruffly, and with such words that, despite his repentance, he left college not to return. The student has now become a lawyer of power and of eminence, able to see and appreciate the condition of a quarter of a century ago. But to-day he still believes that the lack of heart in this college president unworthily ended his college career.

But, above and beyond appreciation of the general condition and specific attitude of students, beyond intellectual and emotional sympathy on the part of college authorities, these authorities are also to coöperate constantly, and directly, in all the

students' concerns. Never, of course, are they to coöperate too fully or too directly. It is best usually for students to manage their affairs themselves, so far as they can. Students' democracy is a good deal like the community's democracy, it is better that they should do things ill for themselves than that these things should be done well for them by another. But, while preserving the conditions of self-dependence, it is well for a faculty to coöperate with students in their concerns. With all fraternities in particular should the governing authorities keep themselves in close touch, not for the sake of directing these organizations themselves, but for the sake of making them of the utmost worth to each individual member, and also for the good order and enrichment of the college. In his annual report to the trustees of Amherst College, in the year 1887, the late President Seeley said: "Besides other help toward the good work of the college, important service is rendered by the societies' houses. No one now familiar with the college doubts, so far as I know, the good secured through the Greek letter societies as found among us. They are certainly well managed. Their houses are well kept, and furnish pleasant and not expensive homes to the students occupying

them. The rivalry among them is wholesome as it certainly seems to be kept within excessive limits. The tone of the college is such that loose ways in a society of its members will be a reproach; the college sentiment, so long as it is reputable itself, will keep them reputable."

Not a few college authorities make constant and wide use of an individual fraternity and of the whole fraternity system in helping any member who may be flagging or lagging, and they use it also in promoting the orderliness of the college. Cooperation with the fraternities and with every organization of the college, as a constant method, represents one of the most effective ways of ennobling the whole college life.

In all adjustments of disorders in the college, the guidance by sound principles and the use of wise methods should be so manifest that the students themselves may receive a worthy training. They are to find in the governing authorities that largeness of vision, that truth of interpretation, that appreciation of the other man's place, that kindness of heart, which shall inspire them to use the same potent forces in after-life. Every settlement, too, should be so made in result, as well as in process, that the students themselves

shall be joined more closely to their college, and to all things that make for wisdom, soberness, and righteousness.

III. THE DORMITORY

Among the important questions which the college man or his home decides, is the question whether he shall or shall not room in a dormitory.

The word "dormitory" in its present meaning, is a new word in academic language; in its present meaning it stands for a building used by a college for housing students. Mullinger, the historian of Cambridge, uses the word in contrast with "study" in speaking of a student in his university of about the year 1550. The present meaning was formerly taken by the word "hostel," or "college," or "hall." The hostel of the English universities of three hundred years ago was a lodging house under the charge of the principal, where students resided at their own cost. This word has never been transferred to America, but it has been transferred to India, Japan and China, and there is in quite as good usage as the blessed institution itself. The word "college," as applied to a building, has been the favorite word in American academic usage. Williams College began in a building long known

as West College. The brick row at Yale of eight buildings was composed of "colleges," though "hall" was the term applied in the earlier time to the first. "Hall" is still used, and to it has been added "house" or "cottage" or "halls of residence," especially as applied to women's colleges. "Dormitory" has, within fifty years, come into good use. It can hardly be called a fitting word except for those who wish, in their earnestness or wit, to represent the college life as torpid!

The foundation of the older college was marked quite as much by the erection of a building for housing students as of one for holding lectures and recitations. In fact, one building usually served for all academic purposes. In the development of colleges, differentiation has occurred, and most buildings now erected are designed for specific purposes. In the foundation of the newer colleges outside of New England the custom of building dormitories has not been constant. In fact, most state universities have declined to accept special responsibility for the domestic interests of students. At the present time, however, certain intimations are made that they are becoming willing to undertake such responsibilities. These men and women have been left, in no small degree, to shift

for themselves. Funds given by the state or by the individual have been required for the erection of libraries, laboratories and other halls. The ordinary home has opened its doors to students, glad to avail itself of means of increasing income, and students have not been loath to accept.

The advantages of dormitory life are not hard to distinguish.

One of the most apparent advantages lies in the tendency of this life to intensify academic atmosphere. The student is apart from his home. The building he occupies is made for the college; he lives with other students. With them he spends happy days and happier nights. The community is academic and of it he is an individual part. He "wears the gown" even if he does not, as the priest says in Kim, "follow the road." His talk, his fun, his tricks, his friendship, are all academic; he takes the academic bath. The worth of such absorption is great. At the altars of good fellowship and of opportunity, as well as at the shrine of scholarship, it is worth while to burn incense. Aloofness from common men's common concerns is, for a time, as good for a boy as at other times it is despicable and disastrous. The idols which men outside of the walls and the gates worship make no

appeal to him. The value of unworldliness is pressed down hard upon his mind. The lawn, the quad, the hall, the campus, the yard, are holy ground. The interpretation which memory makes of such academic conditions represents their value. What a storm of protestation occurs from the intimation of a college board of trustees of the tearing down of a dormitory. "Sacrilege" is the comment. Mr. Lowell once said that when a family leaves its ancestral home, the house should be burned down. A college dormitory is so sacred to the generations of students that it should stand forever.

A dormitory, moreover, fosters that thing or that being called "college spirit." "College spirit," all the college papers are ever declaring, the college lacks. "College spirit," they lament, is not now what it once was. "College spirit," they affirm, we must now have. "Go to, now," say these editors, "we will get college spirit." "College spirit," what is it? This is the formula:—love of teacher and student for the college, *plus* submission of the individual to the general academic good, *plus* appreciation by students of the highest ideals, *plus* songs and sports, as expressing college devotion—these constitute college spirit. "College spirit"

represents men living in close association. To make the fire of college spirit all the pieces of the kindling wood of the student life must lie close together. College spirits make "college spirit."

Dormitory life, moreover, has the advantage of teaching students to get on with each other. It frees from cantankerousness. This ability of association, or of consociation, is of the highest worth. College men, when they fail, though, in fact, they seldom do fail, fail for one of two reasons:—either lack of moral fiber or inability to get on with their fellows. The second cause is far more common. No life represents so efficient a means for the removal of a tendency to cantankerousness as the dormitory. Men must live under the same conditions. They must live together in time as well as space. These forces and methods cut out eccentricities, turn angularities into curves, make men reasonable. There is developed a social taste, a social conscience, a social mind, a social heart and a social will. There is nourished a fine and noble democracy in the individual and a no less noble and fine individuality in the academic democracy.

In this same relation dormitory life has the ad-

vantage of formation of friendships—friendships which prove to be the most intimate and of life-long continuance. The memory of each man calls up such friendships. Let me, however, refer to one or two. I turn to the biography of Archbishop Tait and I find him writing of his going to Oxford. He says: “Arrived at Oxford, I took possession of my rooms in the top attics of Balliol, as completely a garret as could be imagined. I was at once introduced to George Moberly, Tutor of Balliol, whose favor had been bespoken for me. He asked me to breakfast with him next morning, which was Sunday. The party consisted of Herman Merivale—whom I had already begun to know—Manning—whom I never did know well—and Stephen Dennison.”⁹ He mentions friends, among whom were Arthur Stanley, Jowett, Sir Stafford Northcote, Arthur Clough and Lord Coleridge, and he says that the men with whom he lived habitually acquired the name of “the family party.”¹⁰ I turn to the life of Tennyson. Everyone knows of “the Apostles.” The friends among whom he lived were Lord Houghton, Archbishop Trench, Dean Alford and Hallam. Such friend-

⁹ Davidson and Benham's "Life of Archibald Campbell Tait," Vol. I, page 39.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, page 40.

ships arise naturally in the common life of the dormitory.

The biography of Bishop Westcott shows that among his contemporaries at Cambridge were C. B. Scott, late Headmaster of Westminster School; J. E. B. Mayor, Professor of Latin, formerly University Librarian; J. Lll. Davies, the well-known theologian, Vicar of Kirby Lonsdale, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the King; D. J. Vaughan, Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, and Hon. Canon of Petersborough; A. Barry, Canon of Windsor, formerly Bishop of Sydney; Howson, late Dean of Chester, and Hon. E. H. Stanley, late Earl of Derby, formerly Secretary of State for the Colonies.¹¹

I also wish to say that I look upon the dormitory as at once the safest moral place and the strongest agency for forming character. I do not fail to recognize that grave dangers await college men, both within and without dormitory walls. We all know the nature of these perils. They are, comprehensively, the perils of appetite. But the dormitory represents a condition in which supervision can be exercised and always should be. The college stands as an official and personal guardian,

¹¹ "Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott," Vol. I, page 37.

but the dormitory offers, too, the means and the opportunity of forming the strongest character. Man comes closest to man. Brother meets brother, and comes into brotherhood. Each man teaches each man, forming, reforming, inspiring each and all. The floor of every dormitory room is a battle-field where men have fought out great personal moral issues, and have prevailed.

Before I pass on to some of the objections to dormitory life, I wish to refer to one other advantage. It is found in the fact that the college memories of the graduate are most vivid of the personal and material relations of his dormitory home. No such memories does he hold remembering library or club table. His thoughts turn back to Hollis, to Main or to North. He has no such affection for recitation hall or for physics laboratory. When he returns to his twenty-fifth or fortieth anniversary, he seeks out the dormitory room and enters its doorway as a shrine.

“I passed beside the reverend walls
In which of old I wore the gown;
I roved at random thro’ the town,
And saw the tumult of the halls;

And heard once more in College fanes
The storm their high-built organs make,

The thunder-music, rolling, shake
The prophets blazon'd on the panes;

And caught once more the distant shout,
The measured pulse of racing oars
Among the willows; paced the shores
And many a bridge, and all about

The same gray flats again, and felt
The same, but not the same; and last
Up that long walk of limes I passed
To see the rooms in which *he* dwelt,

Another name was on the door;
I lingered; all within was noise
Of songs, and clapping hands, and boys
That crash'd the glass, and beat the floor;

Where once we held debate, a band
Of youthful friends, on mind and art,
And labor, and the changing mart,
And all the framework of the land."

—(*In Memoriam.*)

Yet there are disadvantages and difficulties in the dormitory life for college men.

These disadvantages arise from the necessary conditions and methods of fifteen or fifty men of the age of twenty years living together in one building. The disadvantages are the disadvantages of too great freedom, of too great individual

independence. The freedom may be too great for the intellect: the peril of unwise methods of work or of bad mental habits results. The freedom may be too great for the conscience: evil moral practices may follow. The freedom may be too great for the will: the peril of foolish practices may prevail. The freedom may be too great for the character: the peril of physical, intellectual, and moral debasement may become evident. Physical disorder, boisterousness, rowdyism is not uncommon. The interruption of a man's study by the invasion of a half dozen men, or the wasting of his evening with the slow-going caller, are necessary evils. The sense of individuality in property is ravaged. The application of "*meum*" and "*tuum*" becomes mixed. Good-natured borrowing of books and of clothes is too much suffered.

The comprehensive difficulty of dormitory life lies in the lack of solitude. It is hard to find a chance to be alone. Some men do not wish to be alone. They are alone when they are alone. To change the remark made of Newman, they are most alone when most alone, but they ought to be alone, if not lonely. Other men wish to be alone. In aloneness they are, like Newman, least alone. "If you have a mind, use it," said Walter Badge-

hot, "it is the most interesting thing." But those who like and those who dislike solitude should enter into the halls of silence. Thought, feeling, sentiment, are fed in great, quiet atmospheres. In noble solitudes rich characters and strong intellects are developed.

The chief element in a dormitory is its spirit, its life, its tone. This fine atmosphere depends first, on the students themselves; second, on the head of the house. The students should be organized into some society for promoting the common interest. The organization may have several officers, or may take on the form of a committee. Orderliness, fellowship, sympathy, helpfulness, are the key-notes of such a communistic process. Second, upon the head of the house quite as largely depends its worth. For, there should be a head. The practice obtaining in some colleges of leaving the boys to themselves in a great dormitory is to be deprecated. The peril of disorder, of danger in case of fire, is great. This head should also be a heart, and both should be embodied in a college officer. The higher his official rank, the more influence has the head of the house, but beyond his official rank lies his personal character and bearing. He is in some places called a proctor. He

is never to be regarded as a policeman or prison warden. He is here as a friend, guide and counsellor. His interest, care, oversight, should be close, but not too close. Jane Austen somewhere makes one of her characters say that "Oatmeal should be thin, thin, thin, but not too thin." The supervision of the dormitory officer should be close, but not too close—close enough to show friendship, wise, true, constant—but not so close as to give the impression of undue watchfulness which would free the student from the sense of personal responsibility. Such friendship is hard enough to secure. It represents the best type of character; it embodies genius for boys. Such a friend was Edward Bowen of Harrow. Of him it is said by one who knew him well: "If I attempted to classify his interests, I should be inclined to say that he cared for things somewhat in the following order: boys, literature, games, history, walks, politics. . . . His friendship with his boys held the first place in his heart. . . . He gave his life to his boys." But also it is said: "He had a great power of making older boys judge themselves, and offer an adequate punishment of an intellectual kind for their shortcomings. Throughout in all matters there was an appeal to the boy himself, to

his best part, to his conscience. To train the conscience so that its discernment of right and wrong was clear, and the following of it was habitual, was his method. If there was no conscience, then still there was to be found something to appeal to. I have known him keep a very bad and weak boy straight for a while by an appeal to his honor as a gentleman, when it seemed that nothing could influence him.”¹² Benson, writing of the school-master,¹³ says that in the house he should be “easy, friendly, conversational.” He also commends “courtesy, approbation, appreciation, a ready smile, an agreeable manner, a rebuke given in the form of a compliment,” as more effective than severity. These are the great qualities belonging to the head of a dormitory which help to transmute it into a condition and force, not simply for living, but for life.

The essence of what I have said regarding dormitory life applies, as I have already intimated, to the important organization known as the fraternity. The question which, at first blush, seems so primary, “Shall I join a fraternity?” is, on the whole, unfitting, for one does not join a fra-

¹² “Edward Bowen, A Memoir,” pages 254, 255.

¹³ A. C. Benson’s “The School Master,” pages 26 and 30.

ternity without an invitation, and in most colleges not a few men are not invited. But, presuming that one is invited, the essential element in reaching a decision is this: "Do I wish specially to affiliate myself with a certain body of men?" If one does so wish, it is wise to join; if one does not so wish, it is usually wise not to join. One, of course, does not mean that all of one's closest friends will be found in a fraternity; neither does one mean that if he be not a member he will lack friends, but the meaning is essentially, whether one is willing to give to oneself a certain limitation in friendships, in associations and associates. Of course this limitation represents within itself a certain intensity which might not easily be found without these bounds. This intensity of friendship is of large advantage to some men, and it is of positive disadvantage to others.

On the whole, I think it is well for most men to join a fraternity. Whatever advantage it may be to one in the undergraduate days, this advantage is augmented in the following years. It represents an ease of association with the college which other methods do not embody. It also stands for a permanence of friendship in a world in which friendships are neither too numerous nor too lasting.

IV. ATHLETICS

The question of engaging in what are known as athletic sports is, for many men, a more important question than either where one shall live or how, or whether one shall join a fraternity. I believe that the college should promote athletic sports and that students also should take part in them. The policy of suppression is as unwise as it is impossible. In respect to the worth of these sports of the students I have gathered the testimony of hundreds of men. From this testimony I wish to select the evidence submitted by two or three men, evidence which is of much more value than any *a priori* reasoning. The testimony of these students I unite together without regard to the particular witness who writes.

“When I came to college I was conscious of these facts, first, that all my bodily organs were approaching maturity, and secondly, that systematic exercise produces uniform bodily development. Undoubtedly, the college authorities were agreed on two propositions: that students should exercise their bodies, and that in order to make this exercise beneficial it ought to be regular and systematic, which accounts for compulsory gymnastic exercise

in the curriculum. But the gymnasium to me was a place for those who seek exercise for amusement and who desire only friendly competition. Daily routine work was in itself a bore, and were it not for the companionship of the numbers interested, would have been devoid of any attraction.

“In college athletics I saw a different field of muscular activity in which my bodily-development-plan could be more beneficially and more successfully carried on. I found in the athletic sports of track and field bodily exercise which was interesting and attractive, and which I took with gladness. It never felt burdensome. If I were asked the reasons for such opinion and feelings, I might give—first, that college athletics are open air exercises; secondly, that in consequence of the reciprocal action of mind and body, the most benefit can come only when the exercise is accompanied by mental occupation, my mind was interested while my body was engaged; thirdly, these sports furnished a mental stimulus in setting up an object to be striven for, an object of strength and skill, the object of honor, of victory and supremacy which may not be of great worth, perhaps, but still an honor to the student-mind:—all these crystallized into an ambition to secure representation and recognition

in inter-collegiate struggles for athletic supremacy.

“You may inquire what faculties of the mind were benefited or developed. Good brains contribute quite as much to success as do good muscles since muscle is directed by brain. Of the many faculties of the mind which enter into athletic sports a few might be mentioned, as courage, resolution, perseverance, the faculty for organization and executive power. As to character, success in any athletic sport is inconsistent with a life of debauchery or irregular habits. To enter upon a course of training is to adopt voluntarily methodical habits of life, and one must economize and systematize his time, as also must he give faithful obedience to recognized authority. Athletics are one continual discipline of effort and self-denial.

“But to drop the individual and take up the relation of athletics to the student body, it can easily be observed that the various branches of sport furnish a motive for combined action, and legitimate opportunities for free play, in the development of college patriotism. They conduce to good order in developing university organization which is antagonistic to and moderates class and departmental antipathies. This student organization is

bound together sometimes by a common enthusiasm, at other times by a common sympathy. Again, athletics furnish opportunities for the instructor to meet his students as men interested in a common good which tends to warm up the chilling reserve of a class-room. To the student body athletics make epochs in the history of their college.

“Since I have given you the observations of my experience, it ought to be added that they pertain and relate equally to all branches of athletic sports in which I have indulged. But in regard to the disadvantages of athletics, I may seem prejudiced when I say that but one has come to my notice. Many charge to athletics evils which do not belong there. The one great disadvantage or evil arises from a failure to economize time. An observation of a strict economy will not let the hours adopted for daily exercise interfere with the maintenance of a good standard of scholarship, neither will it permit of an injurious amount of exercise.

“The three college sports of which I can speak from experience are baseball, football and track athletics. The last two of these I have participated in during two years in secondary school and three years in college, while the first mentioned I

have not played in college. I shall speak of these three separately, if I may.

“There appear to me to be three disadvantages in football: (1) All successful players, I believe, face the temptation of the game becoming of too absorbing interest. If a player could place his thoughts on the game as he enters the athletic field and take them off as he leaves the field, then too much time would rarely be given to it. But few men can do this at certain periods of the season. Yet I cannot help but think that this temptation offers opportunity for discipline, for in life does not a man go through periods of excitement when he most needs to be able to buckle himself down to calm, steady work? But most men play each game many times, once in actuality, many times in forethought, and as often in afterthought; and the forethought and afterthought games are usually played in the class-room. (2) Football is a rough game, though it is not a murdering game, as many would have us believe. In my mind, an accident in football resulting in death is as rare as is a fatal fall in the gymnasium or a death blow from a baseball over the heart. Abolitionists of the game find their best arguments, not in the occasional death, but in the comparative frequency of wrenched

joints, torn ligaments and bruised muscles, for there is no denying these are common. (3) Not a little anxiety and worry is often caused the parents of players. I know many boys who immediately after a big game telegraph their parents that they are unhurt.

“The advantages of football, on the other hand, in my mind, are more numerous, but not so easy to speak of definitely. Any sport which requires of the participants, for a degree of success in it, perfect physical condition has strong grounds for appeal to the college man. The time-element, that is, the actual time spent in playing and training, is decidedly in its favor as an exercise. Now, walking is an excellent exercise for some people, but for the college man it is insufficient. In order that I may get enough exercise from walking, I have to spend several hours a day at it, which I cannot spare. Then, too, by the time a man is old enough to be in college he can walk without concentrating his thoughts on it, and consequently does not get any mental rest or change. But in football, in order for a man to be in the best shape for the Saturday’s game, he cannot practice hard more than one hour each day, and, to be sure, while he is playing his thoughts are wholly concentrated on the game.

“In my five seasons on the gridiron I have met with no serious accident to myself, and have witnessed but one to anybody else. I have had, however, my nose broken, and my ankle wrenched sufficiently to keep me on crutches for several days. Yet in my own case I can seriously say that I would have been willing to undergo a dozen such things for the benefits I have received. I now have a strong, healthy body, which, I can say with moral certainty, I would not have had had it not been for my systematic training on the athletic field, and which, indeed, my friends saw the least indications of my having five years ago.

“Track athletics have few disadvantages. I can see no serious consequence for the track man, excepting the long distance man. By the long distance man I mean he who goes into races of a quarter-mile and upwards. Even he has little to fear from daily practice, but sometimes amidst a great cheering crowd he overtakes his strength. I take it, the fault lies in his not having trained properly so as to be able to judge carefully his pace. The physical director of a college should see that an untrained man shall not enter a long run on field day.

“From the standpoint of time and of opportunity for concentrating the mind, track work is

even more fitted to the busy student than football. Rarely a man can train over a half-hour a day without becoming what we call stale. A few minutes of hard work commonly bring the best results. This time does not, of course, include rubbing, etc.

“But not a small part of the good derived from these sports lies in the fact that they force good moral habits onto the participants. I know of many men who are habitual smokers who leave off the practice during training seasons. The same is true of the smaller number who use strong drink. Sometimes the sentiment along this line is so strong that a man in training considers it a disgrace to be caught smoking. I cannot say that training seasons often cause men to leave off these habits permanently, yet the advantages are evident, for the man who gets his body into good physical condition twice, or even once a year, is pretty safe from a slow run-down.

“There is little to be said against baseball, yet I cannot think it so deservedly popular with students as the two other sports. My reasons are (1) at present it is professional, and (2) it takes too much time. There is nothing to prevent a baseball student from spending his whole afternoons on the field, and commonly the schedule is so long

that a player must be out of the city considerable of the time. (3) Baseball men rarely feel under obligation to regulate and better their habits, for the emphasis is laid not on the condition of the whole body but on a throwing arm, hard hands, and an accurate batting eye."

Upon the basis, therefore, of evidence presented by graduates who have themselves taken active part in athletic sports while in college, and especially in football, I desire to submit certain inferences touching the advantages and disadvantages of football. Among the evils to be noted are the following:

1. Danger to life and exposure to injury.
2. Temptation to fraud in making up teams.
3. Temptation to betting.
4. Temptation to roughness.
5. Enthusiasm becoming so great as in certain conditions to approach a form of hysterics.
6. Disadvantages, though slight usually, for the scholarship of certain players.
7. Too great frequency of games.
8. The inability of athletic associations to handle properly large sums of money.
9. The public exposition of young men who are primarily students.

10. Reports in newspapers giving false interpretations and false impressions of collegiate values.

These evils and others are to be lessened or wholly eliminated. For the sake of such elimination I venture to offer these suggestions:

1. Let the idea of gentlemanly sport be strengthened. This ideal is not victory, but the sport itself. College teams and students who support those teams are altogether too eager to win. The American college athlete is more inclined than his brother at Oxford and Cambridge to make athletics an end and not a means,—too much inclined to make it work and not recreation. a vocation and not an avocation.

2. The establishment of this ideal will eliminate the temptation to use as players men who are not genuine students. The evil of professionalism has vastly diminished and is not found in many colleges. It should not be suffered to exist in a single one.

3. The organization which conducts football and other sports, consisting usually of representatives of the faculty, of the student body, and, frequently, of graduates, should be the ablest, wisest and most effective administrative body. In the selection

of its members too great care cannot be exercised.

4. Emphasis should be placed upon competent medical supervision or direction. It would be well for each man who plays football upon the regular team to present a medical certificate of his competency to play.

5. Emphasis should also be placed upon careful scholastic supervision. Every man who wishes to play should be required to maintain a good standing in his classes.

6. A sufficient number of officers should be upon the field to detect all off-side playing and unnecessary roughness, and these officers should have sufficient power to enforce their decisions.

7. A fitting training of the members of all teams should be insisted upon. A training which is irregular, a training which is not adjusted to the degree of proficiency or the lack of proficiency of those being trained, a training which does not represent an ascending movement from the less severe to the more severe, is bad. A training which begins low, rises slowly and rounds off with reasonable vigor and executive facility eliminates many physical risks and evils.

8. Care should be taken to keep down the num-

ber of games which are played. Most teams play too many games, especially too many teams play too many hard games. Hard games should be limited to not more than one a week for the six or seven weeks of the playing period. No team can continually play more than one hard game oftener than every six days. Other games may be played, but they should not be hard; in fact, they should be of the nature of practice games.

9. I also beg leave to suggest it would be well to confine the membership of teams to the students of the undergraduate college. Football is a college and not a professional school game. It belongs to the stage of development. The professional student does not need that physical and intellectual development which football is supposed to give as does the college man. The current rule that no one shall play football more than four years represents the feeling that these four years should cover the collegiate period only.

10. The number of students who play should be increased. The number of men, of course, who can play upon the first or second teams is limited; but the number of men who can try for these teams is unlimited. Every man in every American college for the two months of each opening year, to

whom the doctor can give a certificate of physical soundness, should play football. In a college in which gymnasium work is required football might be used as a substitute for the first two months, as in the last two months of the year track athletics are made a substitute for gymnastic practice.

From the athletic sports of the student to his religion is not so far a cry as it might seem, for each is ultimately designed to secure the worthiest character.

V. RELIGION

In general it may be said that education and religion are one; each has for its subject man. Education and religion are one: each has for its end the highest development of man. Education and religion are one: each uses the same forces, truth and personality. Education and religion are one: each employs the same condition, the best environment. Education and religion are one: each adopts the same method, the application of truth through personality under the best conditions.

But education and religion are different, though each has for its subject humanity. Education considers man primarily as an intellectual being and secondarily as an emotional and volitional being.

But religion considers man primarily as an emotional and volitional being and secondarily as an intellectual being. The school makes its first appeal to the intellect. The church makes its first appeal to the heart and the will. Through the intellect the school reaches the will; through the heart the church reaches the intellect.

Education and religion are different, though each has for its end the highest development of man. Education considers this development primarily in relation to present time and space. Good adjustment is its rallying cry. Religion primarily considers this development, with reference not to times but to eternities; not in relation to spaces but in relation to infinite space.

Education and religion are different, though each uses truth. Education uses primarily the truth of literature, that creation of the time-spirit and of radiant souls; the truth of nature, written on stones and spelled out in the stars, pictured in the lightning's flashes, in the apple's fall and in the bird's flight; the truth of philosophy, revealed in man's nature; the truth of history, the record of man's achievements and failures; while religion uses primarily the truth of those books, canonical and uncanonical, which humanity de-

lights to call sacred, which concern man as a child of the eternal and destined for an everlasting existence.

Education and religion are different, though each uses personality. Yet education calls the one personality, the teacher, who first impresses the truth and secondarily himself; and religion calls the one personality, the pastor, the rabbi or the master, who first impresses himself and secondarily the truth.

Education and religion are different, though they are each like the other. Yet education seeks to create an atmosphere which may be called culture. Appreciation is the keynote of its happy song; and religion seeks to create the atmosphere of worship. Rapture is its highest mood or expression.

Historically the relation of education and religion is likewise identical and different. Each has usually been rabbinical, ecclesiastical and priestly. The rabbi and the ecclesiastic have found their preparation in the school. The prophets had their schools, and the most famous schools of the ancient Hebrews were those for and of the prophets. The One whom all acknowledge to be the most saintly of all the saints and the most beneficent of all

philanthropists, the high priest of humanity, was known as a teacher and the members of his immediate circle were called disciples. For a thousand years and more education was the function of the church. Oxford and Cambridge were religious foundations and still have intimate ecclesiastical relations. Our oldest college still writes "*Ecclesia*" on its shield.

This historical relationship is more evident in the Hebrew nation than in any other. For if to Greek education we are indebted for culture and the arts of the beautiful; and to the Roman education for our conception of government and of law and of civil force; and to Anglo-Saxon education for our training in liberty; to the Hebrew education we are indebted for the idea of righteousness and holiness, the essence of ethical and divine religion. The chief text-books of the Hebrew boy for many an age were the sacred writings and books of his race. His education was religious, and his religion was educative.

In the future, education and religion are to be, as in the past, one and different. Each will still concern itself with man. Each will strive for the highest development of the race. Each will employ truth and personality. Each will seek for the

finest condition and circumstance for its students and saints. But the one will consider man with relation to the times and the other with relation to the infinities. One will regard him primarily as the child of man and the other primarily as the child of God. One will find its satisfaction in adjusting man to his present fellowship, and the other will be content only when it finds him kneeling at the altar of his God in humility of spirit and in reverent worship. The one will seek to make man great, the other to make man good; one to make him more and more human, the other more and more divine.

It is, however, fitting to give a more direct and definite interpretation of the religion of the college student. This religion can be interpreted by what it is not, as well as by what it is. It is not, be it said, a religion of feeling; its origin is not in the heart; it does not belong to the realm of the emotions; it is remote, at once, from ecstasies and from despair. Its motive powers are not found in the desire to win heaven or to avoid hell. It is free from emotion and self-consciousness; it does not study itself. As the eye never sees itself, as the healthy man does not know he has heart or lungs, so this wholesome and religious student is free from

the consciousness of feeling. In the analysis of emotion he never or seldom indulges. The contrast between him and his grandfather, who was in college sixty years ago, is keen and wide. The grandfather asked in dread and fear "Is my soul saved?" The contrast to the father, who was in college thirty years ago, is also great, although less great than in the case of the grandfather. The father asked, "Is your soul saved?" The son does not ask either question. He is content to live the life of the Christian. Salvation is taken for granted in a world of, by, and full of, goodness.

The student's religion is a religion of the intellect. It is rational. It seeks to understand and to interpret. It accepts the unknowable as unknowable, because it is rational to make this acceptance. It accepts and believes in a personal God, because this belief best explains the phenomena of the universe. It does not affirm "I will not believe what I cannot understand," for it recognizes the limitations of the intellect and it appreciates the laws of induction. It grants that one of the most rational things in all the world is faith, belief in a proposition, the evidence of which is not complete. It knows the worth of the will to believe; it has no fear of the intellect; it has no fear of the truth.

Its chief or only fear is that the intellect will not be fully used, and that prejudice or error will creep into its conceptions. It is content with principles; it seeks not to enter into the mysteries of divinity or of providence. Intellectually it accepts that Christ is a revelation of God. It seeks no formal doctrine of the trinity but it does bow before the Christ because His life is the best, his teachings the wisest, His example the most quickening, His character the most perfect and the most inspiring.

The religion of the student is also a religion of the conscience. Its wisdom is moral, as well as intellectual. It seeks to discern the right and to detect the wrong. It makes religion ethical, and ethics religious. It calls in the intellect as a judge to discover and to decide the ethical bases of conduct and of character. It inspires the student with a sense of wrong as wrong, more forceful than a sense of the penalty of wrong. It also instills modesty and humility; it is free from bumptiousness and conceit.

This religion, moreover, is a religion of worship. This quality is at once intellectual, emotional, æsthetic and ethical. It believes in prayer. It may be prayer as a petition—but it is more prayer

as communion with the Divine. It believes in quiet half-hours of devotion in solitudes and alonenesses; it is full of reverence.

The religion of the college student, also, in its exterior respects is a religion of tolerance. It stands for liberty, asking for itself the right to believe; it grants a similar right to every other believer. It knows that its vision is of one side of the shield only, and that its apprehension is not comprehension. It requires no reasoning to prove that stars seen at different angles may be different, and that out of the ocean of infinite depth the largest bucket draws only a drop. This tolerance is not negative. It seeks to quicken each one to discuss and to hold the truth for himself, to believe for himself, and to live his own life.

This religion is one which comprehends all life; it makes no distinct division between the secular and the sacred. All of life, all of being, is divine in origin, process and result. It yet respects times, seasons, sabbaths, holy places. It is reverential and it marks the difference between having religion and being religious. It recognizes that omnipresence fills all space and all time, that all things were made by the Creator. It has, in itself, certain elements of Lucretius.

The religion of the student is one of service. It seeks to do good. The number of ministries carried on by the college man and woman are numberless. It is, in one way, too large. Its Sunday schools in rural districts, its boy brigades, its working in social settlements, its scouts, are intimations of the field of academic service. Toynbee Hall represents it in spirit in the United States, as well as in fact in England. Its service is broad, as well as earnest.

As a part of the life of the student, both religious and intellectual, emerges the question of studying on Sunday, although a very minor question at its first statement it seems to be.

That the American college student is inclined to work seven days a week and that many American college students do work seven days a week are pretty clear facts. If the reader should ask an ordinary student whether he worked on Sunday he would promptly receive an affirmative reply. I recently heard a Congregational pastor in a college town having some three thousand college students affirm that nine-tenths of the students and teachers in the university studied Sundays. Studying on the Sabbath is not at all confined to students who are known as irreligious. Possibly as large a pro-

portion of those who are recognized as Christians devote at least a part of the Sabbath to study as of those who are not recognized as Christians. Men distinguished for their active Christian work frequently, if not constantly, transform Sunday into a work-day. Be it said, too, that this condition does not belong to the colleges only. A large proportion—judging from what I know, not far from one-half—of the students in the upper classes of the high schools use a part of Sunday in the preparation of Monday's lesson. These students are members of homes and are under the immediate supervision of their parents.

The causes of this condition are almost as patent as is the fact of the condition itself. A prevailing and comprehensive cause lies in the general and increasing disregard of Sunday. It is constantly said that "the Sabbath is going." The remark would be quite as true, "The Sunday is gone." That the Sunday of certain people of two hundred years ago is gone, one can well rejoice. But that the Sunday which is primarily a day of rest and worship is going, or is gone, one deeply laments. That the Sunday, too, which is a day of rest for all people—even if it be for worship of a small minority—is gone, one also sorrows over. But, whether

with pain or without, one must simply recognize that in the general disregard of the Sabbath, its two twin purposes of worship and rest are constantly eliminated for the college man.

A second cause lies in the proper and right desire of the college man to enlarge his knowledge, to learn his lessons, to secure intellectual enrichment. These conditions represent to him the supreme intellectual purposes of his college education. In each to-day the college student looks forward to every to-morrow. Sunday and Monday are no exceptions to this rule. The teacher assigns tasks to be done and to be presented as done on the first workday of the week. Certain professors *seem* to assign on Friday and Saturday lessons unusually long and exceptionally hard. For professors have been known to reply, when students uttered protests against the length of the lessons or the difficulty of the tasks assigned on the last days of the week, that "Sunday is a free day in which you can have ten hours for work." But whether professors do or do not assign extra tasks, the faithful student desires to get the most out of and through his college course, and, therefore, the temptation to work Sunday is severe.

Akin to this desire for intellectual enrichment is

the desire to use Saturday, or Saturday afternoon, at least, as a holiday. Most colleges still retain Saturday afternoon as a time of freedom from college exercises. Certain colleges, however, are coming to use Saturday afternoon like the afternoon of any other day in the week, so hard is it becoming to find sufficient hours of daylight for lectures and recitations. The student is, and ought to be, a man of pleasure. He wishes to have a good time. Sitting at his books for eight or less or more hours a day for five days in the week, obliged to follow a certain order throughout this time, the coming of the afternoon of Saturday is welcomed as a time of rest and play. He therefore finds himself unwilling to give himself hard to the tasks of his books upon that afternoon. But frequently he is obliged to choose between, on the one side, making his Saturday afternoon a time of work and his Sunday a day of rest and, on the other side, making the Sunday a time of work and the afternoon of Saturday a time of rest. If he play Saturday afternoon, he must study Sunday. He can keep his Sunday free from work only by spending the hours of Saturday afternoon over his books.

It is also to be remarked that the question of Sunday work is far more serious for the college

woman than it is for the college man. For the college woman is obliged to render to herself many services which the college man perhaps ought to render himself, but which he usually declines to render. The simple fact is that the matter of clothes represents a much greater interest for the woman in college than for the man. For women in college tell me that half a day a week should be reserved for caring for one's clothes. Thus the period for recreation for the college woman is so much lessened over that which the college man enjoys. The demand, therefore, which she makes for recreation is far stronger than that which he makes, and the argument which she offers to herself and her friends in behalf of studying seven days in the week is more persuasive than any which her collegiate brother can offer.

In removing such conditions, which prove to be temptations, the colleges have adopted two or three methods. One of these methods consists in making Monday a holiday, or at least in making Monday morning a half-holiday. Such freedom, of course, largely removes the temptation to study Sunday except from the most foreminded of the students. For that student is unique, although he does exist, who will use Sunday in the preparation of the les-

sons set for Tuesday or Wednesday, when Monday is to him a day as free as Sunday itself. Some colleges also try to lessen what they would regard as the evil of Sunday work by making the larger part of the recitations of Monday consist of exercises in the Bible. Such exercises may belong to the Greek department; and in that case the Greek of the New Testament becomes the object of study quite as close as the Greek of Sophocles or of Demosthenes. Various exercises in the English Bible are also set for Monday morning. For it is held that if the men will study Sunday it is better for them to study their Bible than to study their chemistry or psychology.

In order to lessen the amount of study done in the American college on Sunday two or three other methods which possibly may be of some value are open. The method, of course, is not open of commanding the students not to study Sunday. The wise college, like the wise parent, will give very few positive commands. For if the college does give positive commands to men of about the age of twenty, it is usually found that the commands are honored far more in the breach than in the observance. It weakens the influence of the college as well as hurts the student to give commands which

the student will break and which, in advance of the giving, the college knows the student will break, and which also the college has no means of detecting whether the individual student has broken or kept.

Among the means which possibly might prove to be somewhat persuasive, it may be said that it is wise to try to convince the student that one day in seven should be to him a day of rest. It should be easy to cause him to believe that the Sabbath is to him a physical necessity. No nation, no man as a rule, no horse, no machine, can run constantly without going to pieces earlier than it should go to pieces. The necessity of the Sabbath as found in the human constitution is a far more significant reason to the student than any command found in the twentieth chapter of Exodus or than any technically religious interpretation of Christ's remark that the "Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." In the case of the Sabbath, as in the case of smoking, the moral element may have small weight in persuading men, but the hygienic element may and should and does have great weight.

It may also be said to the student that he can do more work in six days than he can in seven through the concentration of his powers. The mer-

chant who affirmed that he could not do his business in twelve months, but that he could in eleven, was a wise man. One of the greatest needs of the American college man is the need of sheer and absolute concentration. He should learn the summoning of all his power for the performance of a specific task. Such concentration may be both the cause and the result of the freedom from all work upon one day of the seven.

It also becomes the duty of the college through the proper agency to indicate to the students what is the best use to be made of the Sabbath. The idea of rest as intellectual vacancy has long ago faded and, of course, it ought to have faded. One can no more expect the mind of a college student to remain vacant on the Sabbath than one can expect the water in the boiler to remain cold when there is fire burning beneath. One should not ask either that the employments of the Sabbath should be entirely separate or remote from the employments of the week. The studies of the Sabbath should minister to the value of the other studies, and yet they should be so apart from the week-day studies that their pursuit should bring into service faculties different from those employed in the week-day pursuits.

It is to my mind fitting that the college student should give to himself a very free range of reading on the Sabbath. Biography, history and novels may represent to him powers of enlargement, enrichment and of inspiration which are the choicest results of his regular studies; and yet these readings may be in themselves quite apart from the contents of his ordinary books. The college student should come to the evening of his Sunday having a body rested, having a mind clearer, a heart purer, a will more firmly set to the right, appetites under firmer and more constant control, desires more aspiring, purposes loftier, his whole nature aflame with finer and nobler enthusiasms, than were his at the sunrising of that day. Reading, reflecting, talking, the walk in the field, the walk on the street, worship in the great congregation, worship in solitude, conversation with dearest friends by letter or by tongue, represent the wisest methods for securing these precious results.

VI. EARNING HIS WAY

One of the primary questions asked by thousands of boys who think of going to college or who are in college, is the question, "Can I earn the whole or a part of my way?" For at once the affirmation

is firmly made, "My parents cannot send me, I must put myself through."

The number of American boys poor in purse, rich in brain, is large. Many of such boys wish to go to college. Not a few of such boys believe they cannot go. They know that money is necessary for going to college, as it is necessary for going almost anywhere, and the money they lack.

For such boys and to such boys I wish to say that they should at least make the attempt to go. Boys of a certain type who do make the attempt will succeed. What therefore is the type of the boy who should make the attempt? Upon the answer to this question the whole matter rests. The boy who can worthily make the attempt to go to college with little or no money represents at least six elements.

First. He is to have a sound body. His health should be vigorous. The strain to which he will subject his body, and the trials which he will give to his health, will be heavy. Only a fine physical condition can bear up against the pressure.

Second. The boy should have an adequate intellectual preparation for pursuing the studies of the course. In his endeavor to earn his way he will use up time and strength, which, if he were free

from these necessities, he would give to his intellectual work. In order, therefore, for him to maintain a good place as a student he should enter college, if it be possible, with a certain surplus of scholastic attainments. If a boy poor in purse is thinking of going to college, but finds himself not well prepared to enter, he should delay in order to make his preparation amply sufficient.

Third. The boy of the type who is coming to college should be a boy of facility in doing things. He should be, to use a most convenient epithet, handy. He should have an instinct for work,—for finding it, and for doing it.

Fourth. The element of handiness has close relation to another necessary element—faithfulness. The instinct to duty should be strong. Whatever task is given he should perform with both honesty and honor. He should seek not only to do his duty, but more than his duty. He should earn more than he receives; give in service for more than he gets in pay.

Fifth. Moreover, the boy should, of course, possess a sound character. The cardinal virtues should indeed be cardinal in his constitution. Justice, temperance, forbearance, benevolence, should represent the great square of his character. Any

ethical weakness, however slight, may prove serious.

Sixth. In the last place, the boy who is working his way through college must possess the elements of pluck, patience, and persistence. His will must be strong. He is in grave peril of becoming tired and of giving up the struggle. The struggle is long and hard. He will need his second wind, his third wind.

The boy who embodies these elements may worthily attempt giving himself an education. He will find opportunities of earning money. He will find the college making to him grants out of its funds. He will find friends, unknown to him in person, rising not so much to call him blessed, as to bless him with gifts of money.

The kinds of work which the man putting himself through college performs are many and diverse. Serving as waiters in college eating clubs, as janitor or caretaker of college buildings, as salesmen or collectors, street lamp-lighters, tutors, church janitors, theater ushers, laundry agents, teachers in night schools and social settlements, caring for furnaces, mowing lawns, serving as clerks in hotels, represent a few of the many kinds of work offered.

Regarding the sums that are earned by some college students I know. Mr. X. during his freshman year earned by working in a shop \$40.00. In the last three years of his course his earnings were:

Sophomore Year:

Waiting on table	\$ 55.00
Working on Saturday in shops	50.00
Working during Christmas and Easter vacations .	30.00
Working in College Library	20.00
Copying for a professor	15.00
	<hr/>
	\$170.00

Junior Year:

Working in shops Saturdays	40.00
Lighting street-lamps	185.00
	<hr/>
	\$225.00

Senior Year:

Lighting street-lamps	\$200.00
Working in college office	75.00
Tutoring	75.00
	<hr/>
	\$350.00

Mr. Y. in his Freshman year received \$50.00 in prizes, and in his Sophomore year by office work he earned \$125.00 and by other work \$50.00. In his Junior year he earned \$300.00 by office work.

During his Senior year and summer vacation he earned \$650.00, a larger amount than he spent.

Mr. Z. earned in his college course \$908.80. The larger amount was derived from serving as college janitor at twenty cents an hour, from serving as a tutor in a family at \$6.00 a week, from taking charge of a boys' club three nights a week at \$1.50 a night, from serving as night watchman of college buildings, and from acting as a general utility man in a private family.

The experiences of these three men are typical. They illustrate the truth that the man of sound body, well prepared to do the intellectual work of the college, having facility, faithful in service, sound in character, and possessed of pluck, may worthily and wisely make the attempt to give to himself an education.

VII. SOME MISCONCEPTIONS

As I think beyond financial and all other details, and in broad relations, of the thousands of college students with whom I have had association, I find they are victims of certain misconceptions, or misinterpretations.

One of the more common of the more serious misinterpretations made by college students relates to

the value of a college education. Some students regard a college education as of very great significance. It is the all, the be-all, and the end-all of life. To the college they have looked forward with longing and contentment. They have neither dared nor cared to look beyond college years or college walls.

This condition was more common formerly than it is now. The division between the academic world and the non-academic world was more marked. Formerly, if the professional man was not always a college graduate, the college graduate was usually a professional man. To-day the college man finds his way into every calling where brain and character have an opportunity,—and what calling is there where brain and character lack an opportunity? The college student, seeing his brother alumnus doing the things that every man does, is not inclined to look upon the college experience as unique.

Some students, on the other hand, regard a college course as a matter of but slight consequence. It is a mere incident or accident. Its four years are only five per cent. of one's four-score years of life. Its successes bear no relation to life's success, and its failures bear no relation to

life's failures. The student delights to point out the men who have not gone to college, and who have written novels like Howells' or made inventions like Edison's or Bell's. He is also not disinclined to refer to the first scholars and honor men who have failed in life's business.

Wherein lies the truth?

It is safe to say that college is not the be-all or the end-all. It is also safe to say that college is not a mere incident. The college is neither a purpose, a final cause, nor a result; the college is always a means, a method, a force. Its power over some men, be it confessed, is slight. Some men leave the college the same men they came. The power of the college over other men, be it said, is hardly less than tremendous. It has turned the stream of their life's career. It has given them a vision of possibility. It has inspired desires for making real the content of this vision. It has opened the windows of their souls, and the air of human life has swept in to make virile character. It has brought them to the world of good books and the preciousness of good souls. It has given them a sense of proportion, an appreciation of values, and a respect for the law that underlies all laws. It has deepened individuality; it has less-

ened eccentricities. It has, though deepening the sense of individuality, also deepened the sense of humanity. It has taught them that bluster is not force and that force is not blustering. It has taken away caddishness and callowness, and made a man a genuine good fellow. It has taught that two *plus* two equal four, and that nature respects and works with a man who always makes two *plus* two equal four, and that nature contends and declines to work with men who try to make two *plus* two equal either three or five. It has trained men to win triumphs of the noblest sort and to bear defeats with calmness. It has increased respect for the decencies and sanctities of life. It has enlarged the sense of humanity and developed the sense of friendship. It has given a new conception to friendship. It has, with all intellectual enrichment, tried to add strength to will's strength and sensitiveness to the mainspring of conscience. It has taken the son and the daughter from the family, but it has given an added respect for the preciousness of the hearthstone. Without infringing upon the personal relations which a man bears to his God, it has sought to make that relation more vital, more reasonable, more natural, and more commanding.

Another current misinterpretation which the college student makes relates to good manners. He is inclined to depreciate the value of naturally good manners, and inclined to overvalue the worth of technical good manners.

By technical good manners I mean obedience to the formal commands of good society. They are important enough, but they are not one-half so important as most men think them to be. The observant person soon learns them; and the inexperienced person, if he have gumption, soon adopts them. The student need give small attention to them. Simple good manners are far more important. Kindness and gentleness, sincerity, goodness, respect, consideration for others and for their prejudices and principles, these are the essence of good manners. They are the root whence springs the gentleman, whether he be a Sir Philip Sidney on the battlefield, or a fellow jostling his fellows in the college halls. Good manners are the beatitudes of moral conduct. A man who obeys simply the Ten Commandments, and glories in the obedience, would be a most unpleasant man to live with. About the pillar of the Ten Commandments of moral conduct should twine the graces of peace-making, of purity of heart, and of humility of

spirit. Good manners are to the gentleman what clouds are to the setting sun, the radiation of power and beauty. The essence of them is self-forgetfulness, and remembrance of others.

A further misinterpretation, which is also an overvaluation, relates to moral values and intellectual. College men are inclined to have an undue appreciation of the intellectual values and an undue depreciation of ethical values. Most men come to college with the idea that the college is the creator of intellectual powers only. I know there is much to say in behalf of this proposition. The college is to create intellect. The text-book is the Genesis of our intellectual Bible. The class-room is the bare waste over which the intellectual spirit is to brood and to bring forth life.

All this is true, must be true; and one is glad that it is true. If it is not true, the college had better burn the library, blow up the laboratory, and send the students home.

But we have learned that man is not intellect only, and we have learned that intellect does not work alone. Man is a unit. One cannot attain intellectual results unless the feelings are in a proper state and the will fittingly directed. If the spirits are riotous, the powers of reflection are disturbed.

If the appetites are not properly controlled, the power of perception is lessened. Man is one. His powers are to be kept, and kept in equilibrium. But one should know that the ethical forces are of great value. Of course it is more important to be strong than to be able to decline *vis*, to stand four-square to all the heavens than to be able to prove propositions about the parallelogram, to have a pure heart than to speak pure English. Of course it is, and the most materialistic of all college officers would say that it is.

Another lack of proper estimation is seen in the overvaluation of knowledge and the undervaluation of power. It is natural for a college man to overestimate the value of knowledge. Has he not been learning all these eight or ten years? Has he not passed his examinations according as he knew, and failed according as he did not know? If he knew, he has been called bright, clever, brilliant, a "genius in the bud"; if he did not know, he has been called stupid, foolish, asinine. If he knew, his pathway has been an easy and happy one; if he did not know, his pathway has been a hard and miserable one.

But it is to be strongly said that knowledge is of small worth for its own sake. Knowledge is

the chief worth because it gives one material for thought, and the process of acquiring knowledge is of chief value because it trains one in the methods of thinking. Thought is of worth because it is the chief power among men. The college and the world cannot have too many scholars. There will be few, and only a few, at the best. But the world most needs men who can *think* largely, broadly, justly, accurately, and comprehensively.

VIII. SOME CRITICAL QUESTIONS

But more important than the consideration of certain misinterpretations made by students are the problems or groups of problems, with which they find themselves enmeshed. For to the college man the years do seem to furnish a series of critical questions.

One of these problems is the question, At what time in his college career should one choose his vocation? For, as a rule, every man must choose his vocation. Sometimes the vocation chooses the man. A vocation is a calling, a calling from the stars, a calling from the hills, a calling from God. Happy the man who is thus sure he is walking in the ways of divine appointment. But most must interpret and determine for themselves.

The only part of the somewhat manifold, complex problem, which I now propose, is the element of time. In my judgment, a man should not choose a calling before he comes to himself. College is a process of self-discovery. Each man is a Columbus to himself. When one knows, as far as one can know, what he is, he is able to determine his fitness and his fitnesses. In advance he is liable to mistake juvenile likes for lasting preferences, temporary adjustments for permanent aptitudes, and trivial interpretations for great choices. Did not Coleridge want to be a cobbler, and did not Lecky search for a long time for his calling? Did not Gladstone want to be a clergyman, and did not his father urge him to defer the choice of his vocation until he had completed his education?¹⁴ It is well, therefore, I believe, for a man to leave this great selection until the latter part of his course. He is thus saved from narrowness, and is saved unto broadness. He is saved from short-cuts which make short men. He thus lessens the risk of a fundamental mistake. The President of a great technical school said to me, that, on the day of his graduation, a student remarked, "I now know that I do not want to be a mechanical engineer; I now

¹⁴ Morley's "Life of Gladstone," Vol. I, page 82.

know that I want to be a lawyer." Said to me within a few days, a member of the bar of Cleveland that, "I ask myself, sometimes, whether I ought not to have been a minister?"

At the age of twenty-seven, John Stuart Mill wrote to Carlyle saying, "I have certainly changed much since you knew me; in some things I have become, I think, more like yourself, in others more unlike; I am partly reconciled to not seeing you this year by the thought that next year I shall probably be firmer on my legs, spiritually speaking, and shall have a clearer and more fixed insight into what I am to be and to do than I have at present."¹⁵

A second problem relates to the methods of solving problems. Shall that method be the direct or the indirect method? Shall one solve his own problems or shall they solve themselves? The difference between solving one's problems by one's own might and main and letting problems solve themselves, has a rather pregnant illustration in the difference between the methods of Herbert Spencer and of John Stuart Mill. That difference is well set forth by Elliot in his edition of the Letters of John Stuart Mill. He says, "When George Eliot asked Spencer how it was that

¹⁵ Letters of John Stuart Mill, Vol. I, page 64.

he had no wrinkles on his forehead, as might be expected in one who had thought deeply, he replied that it was because he was never puzzled. His inactive disposition recoiled from the notion of wrestling with a problem in an attempt to solve it. Whenever he was confronted with a problem whose solution was not obvious to him he would push it aside, and abandon all conscious effort to solve it. But the matter would not usually be entirely lost sight of; it would stick in the back of his mind, and by-and-by, very likely while thinking of something else, a little inward flash would occur, rendering the solution somewhat less obscure than it was before. With the lapse of time other flashes would follow; and after several years, maybe, the solution of that problem would be set forth with the marvelous lucidity that Spencer commanded, as an integral portion of his system of philosophy. This is what we describe as true genius; no puzzling, no conscious effort, no weary drudgery, or labour, nothing that education can ever supply; simply a succession of sudden inward flashes illuminating the whole of the darkened field.

“How does this method compare with the method of John Stuart Mill? The contrast is indeed great. Mill describes how he acquired ‘the mental

habit to which I attribute all that I have ever done, or ever shall do, in speculation; that of never abandoning a puzzle, but again and again returning to it until it was cleared up; never allowing obscure corners of a subject to remain unexplored because they did not appear important; never thinking that I perfectly understood any part of a subject until I understood the whole.' In short, Mill's method was that of conscious and vehement effort directed towards the end he had in view. He solved his problems by laborious application and study; the very reverse of the brilliant and facile methods of Spencer." ¹⁶

For those who make no approach to the scholastic resources of the one man, or to the effectiveness of the analytical quality of the other, the best method, I think, is a combination of the two methods of Spencer and of Mill. Let one's problems settle themselves so far as they can. Let one be content to wait. But, also, while one is waiting, he should be willing to struggle with and for his problems. Such a union, I think, promises to bring forth results satisfactory.

Another problem concerns a matter which moves in the world-atmosphere and which is, also, imme-

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Introduction, XXVIII-XXIX.

diate in time and place for the American College man and woman. It is this: How far forth shall education be practical, and how far forth non-practical—how far forth should it be of the immediate and momentary advantage, and how far forth should it be of general worth? A discrimination, and definition of the practical, finally comes down to terms of cash. What will make money, or what money represents, is practical; and what will make the most money, or bring most largely the results of money is the height of the practical. What cannot be turned into money is not practical. That is theoretical or general.

Now the college and university have one and only one answer to give to this question, an answer which it would never give thoughtlessly or without consideration or considerateness. It is the answer that the college is founded, not to teach one to make a living, but to help one to live; not to make money, but to make highest life and character. It will help one to make a living and to make money, but such a result is not its purpose, or vocation. The mother who wrote to the teacher of her son saying, "Please don't teach James any more poetry. He is going to be a grocer," may have been logically right. Poetry will not directly help a boy to sell,

or put up or deliver groceries. But as the body means more than the raiment and the soul more than the body, it is true that college must stand for things of the mind and not of the mint. It is still true, as the leading newspaper of the world said two years ago, "We are told that learning is only valuable if it helps a man in the struggle for life. But, if that is ever generally believed, the universities will change their nature, and our civilization will become only an elaborately organized barbarism. Universities rose into being and flourished in power and splendor because their business was to help, not the individual in his struggle for life, but the world in its effort to rise above the struggle for life. The struggle for life could never have produced them, and, if it absorbs all the thoughts of men, it will destroy them and all learning with them. In the past they have proved to the world that the struggle for life in its fiercer and cruder forms is not everything. In the present they have a task as difficult and more subtle—namely, to persuade men that, however much discipline there may be in that struggle, they must still refuse to give all their intellect to it; that life is not all a war between either nations or individuals, but at

its highest a peace that is not even armed. Universities have been and must still remain sanctuaries of the human.”¹⁷

Yet what is the most practical thing? I said it was getting or having money. But is there not a broader definition of the practical? The practical, is it not that which one practices, which one uses most, most constantly in time and constantly in place, or in vocation? And what is that thing? Is it not one-self? One's mind, conscience, will? To make one-self most efficient, to keep one-self fit, one's thinking comprehensive, consistent, just, delicate, true; one's heart pure, one's conscience keen, one's will strong, that is the most practical thing. Lord Thring, a brother of Thring, of Uppingham, wrote most of the laws passed during Gladstone's administrations. What are the qualities of language still required in making a statute? Clearness, comprehensiveness, definiteness, exactness, are largely among them. Lord Thring said that these were the qualities which were demanded of him in his reading the most famous of the Greek historians. To be a thinker, therefore, is the most practical thing in the world. To be a large man is to be the most practical thing. To be a good man

¹⁷ *The London Times*, Editorial, 18 July, 1911.

is the most practical thing. The college will help one unto such a result. But not for its practical worth, does the college thus help, but for the worth which belongs to one as a son of man and as a child of God.

Another problem, of relations less broad, is often presented to the student: it is: how far should one live for himself, and how far for his college? Should he test the worth of his course by what he gets out of it, or by what he is able to give through it? One sees examples of these two types. One student comes up thinking, "These four years are few and short. They are a quadrennium the like of which cannot again be mine. I must clutch and cram. Reading great books, studying under great teachers, reflection on great questions,—to these single and supreme forces and conditions, I must give myself." For such singleness of devotion one cannot but have warm approval. How many of the great men of human history have thus suffered and rejoiced, labored and struggled, in their course of education!

Yet one cannot refrain from the feeling that the aloofness which such devotion requires and disciplines may defeat its own purpose. The college is apart from life, but it is a part of life. The college

is a time and place in which one is, as in life itself, to do, as well as to receive, to feel, to love, to serve. Yet such service of the day, and of the quartette of years, is not to blind one to the larger significance. One is not to sell forty in order to buy four. One is doing the most for his college of to-day, and for its lasting to-morrow, when one is transmuting himself, through being the thoughtful, large, reflective student, into the rich, fine, gracious, strong, effective personality.

Another problem, somewhat akin to that which I have just stated, relates to what may be called "divided loyalties." To two sets of such loyalties I wish to refer. One has, and rightly too, a sense of loyalty to one's self. Allegiance to one's thought, to one's career, to one's success, is an evident right or duty. One wishes, and he ought to wish, to make his life a triumph. Ambitions stir, great prizes allure, skyey peaks challenge every endeavor; but presently, with increased maturity born of experience, of reflection, dawns a sense of duty. "I ought" begins to quicken; a feeling of judgment and responsibility emerges. Between one's appreciation of personal success and one's appreciation of what he ought to be and to do arises a collision. It may be a conflict, long and hard, it

may be a fight, usually fought alone, alone with one's God. On which side of the field, the side of duty, or the side of pleasure, lies the victory? It may seem doubtful, but not really in doubt is it for the true man. But the fight is hard, and the fight is a lonely fight too, and those who look on from the outside, the spectators, can look on, in silent hopefulness and prayer.

But a further divided loyalty may arise out of this very victory of the "I ought." It lies in the allegiance which a man feels is due to his friends, his family, his father, his mother, and the allegiance which he knows he owes to his higher self. His family has outlined for him a course of conduct. Long and with care has the family ambition been held. At times, perhaps usually, this man has had no thought but of his own acceptance of this purpose, but there dawns upon himself the sense that he is not fitted by ability or by wish for carrying out such a desired aim. Other purposes impel, other moods move, other work commands. His "I ought" comes into collision with the wish of those whom he respects and loves, and to whom he owes obedience, to a degree, at least. For him, however, there is only one method. He must be free. But his freedom he must not abuse. Frank-

ness, kindness, considerateness must be his mood. Out of such a mood, he will bear himself well to parents and to friends. Patient, also, should be their mood. "Loose him and let him go."

To one more problem I must refer. It is the question of maintaining one's enthusiasms under a developing intellectual life. How to keep one's emotions free and full while the rational nature grows, to have a heart warm and responsive as the reason becomes disciplined, more thoughtful, more reflective, that is the question. For it is the experience of many college men that, as the one faculty of the reason develops, the other of the heart is in peril of being atrophied. The danger is a real one and not a shadow caused by the philosopher's lamp. In order to avoid it, I venture to intimate two or three methods:—First: Keep one-self in close touch with one's associates. The worth of friendships is to be emphasized. Let other people come into one's life just as far as good taste permits, and one is to enter into other people's lives just as fully as is fitting. Second: Let one seek to find and to emphasize the larger relations of one's studies. One is tempted to see and to feel only the narrow and the narrowing relations. To illustrate. Let Latin be interpreted as the language of a conquer-

ing people, of a people who brought great blessings to the race, who helped to preserve the rich results of antiquity, who helped to make laws, and to found states. Let Mathematics be interpreted in the largest way. It is thinking as God thinks. My point is, interpret one's work, not as a narrow task, but as a window through which one looks into the eternities, the immensities, and the infinities. Third: Moreover keep one-self in relation to the Being whom we call God. He is the one source of energy, the one inspirer of wisdom, the one consolator in sorrow, the one interpreter of life's mysteries, the one deliverer in life's bondages. Let education be religious, religion educative. Thus the heart will still be hearty and enthusiastic, as the reason becomes more rational.

Thus, while I write of the student, I find myself directly writing to him. For, after all, he is the center of the whole college circle, or if not the center whence is drawn that circle, he is the circumference within which are included the parts and the forces and the conditions that constitute the college both real and ideal.

CHAPTER IV

THE METHODS AND TOOLS

IF the purpose of the ideal college is the giving of a liberalizing education, if the forces in giving this education are comprised largely in the Faculty and body of Trustees, and if the student represents the subject who is receiving the education, it may at once be said that the methods and the tools used in giving this education lie in what is known by the nondescript word, curriculum, or the course of study.

I. THE COURSE OF STUDY

The course of study in a college is no longer a course which the college lays upon each student. The course represents rather an opportunity of which the student may avail himself. The chief demand made by the college upon the student relates to the number of hours that he shall devote to the work, and also to the maintenance of a certain scholastic standard. The course of study is largely elective or optional, so far as the choice of what

studies the student shall pursue is concerned. In making the most profitable use of this condition three principles may be applied:—The professorial, the professional and the personal. These three epithets indicate the primary rules which should determine the choice of one's studies in the college.

II. PRINCIPLES FOR SELECTING

By the professorial principle I mean that certain studies are chosen by the student on the ground that they are taught by a professor for whom the student has special esteem. The studies themselves may be liked or they may be disliked. If they are liked, they are elected not on the ground that they are liked, but on the ground that the professor who teaches them is liked. The studies may be disliked, but the teacher may be so esteemed as to lead to the choice of them for the sake of having him.

The chief advantage lying in this method of election is found in the fact that those qualities and elements of character in the teacher which are the basis of esteem are formed in the student himself. Like makes like. If perspicuity and thoroughness characterize the teacher, perspicuity and

thoroughness become characteristic of the student. If such cardinal qualities as justice, courage, graciousness, and moderation, characterize the teacher, the same qualities become qualities of his students themselves. The professor is a genuine creator: a Frankenstein indeed, only the life which he creates is real, vital, beneficent and eternal. This advantage is of the greatest worth. It embodies the essence of truth found in the remark of President Garfield touching the education which Mark Hopkins gave to an individual. The disadvantage of this professorial method of election of studies lies in the fact that the student, while becoming in most respects a worthy personality, may be yet lacking in the intellectual elements of a vigorous character. He fails to know his subjects and so fails to receive from the teacher proper increment of intellectual power. He is in danger of being content with being a worshiper of a man and of not becoming a force inspired to render the highest service. Yet this peril is usually not realized. The teacher declines to be looked upon as an idol and seeks to arouse his students to become large and earnest workers.

The selection of courses of study upon the professorial basis is a condition obtaining more com-

monly in the small than in the large colleges. In the small college the person seems to count for more and the subject for less, and in the large college the subject seems to count for more and the person for less. I have also sometimes thought, and possibly without sufficient reason, that in the state universities the influence of the personality of the professors is less than it is in the privately endowed and privately supported college.

The second principle of election is the professional one. It consists in the choice of one's course of study on the basis of the choice of one's vocation. At this point lies an important discrimination. What degree of relationship should exist between the studies pursued in the undergraduate college and the studies pursued in the professional school? On the one side it is said that the age of entering and of graduating from college has vastly increased. The studies of the professional school are far more scholastic, and their content is more orderly in arrangement, and more valuable as a discipline, than the studies formerly pursued. The competitions of the professions are exceedingly sharp. The modern world demands expert service. Therefore the student, not far from the middle of his undergraduate course, should be

gin to pursue those studies which will directly prepare him for the studies of his professional course. The man who intends to become a lawyer, should, for instance, take constitutional law, history, economics, and psychology,—studies which contribute directly to his preparation for the legal profession. The man who is to become a doctor should take chemistry, biology and physics,—studies which have a close relation with the studies of the medical school, and with the practice of his subsequent profession. The man who is to be a minister should take English, philosophy, sociology, and economics,—studies which have an intimate relationship with the preparation for the ministry and with the service of the ministry itself.

But on the other side it is affirmed that adequacy of professional equipment presupposes a broad general training. Great professional power demands great intellectual discipline. This discipline is best secured by a broad undergraduate course of study. The members of a profession are obliged to devote themselves to their profession exclusively. They are in grave danger of narrowness. The competitions of professional life are indeed sharp. For these and for similar reasons the one who is to enter a profession should not in his

undergraduate course select those studies which have a direct relation to his professional career. The one who proposes to become a doctor should not, on this ground, take chemistry and biology and physics only, but the one who proposes to become a doctor should take the course which the lawyer or the minister according to the previous suggestion should take. The basis is to become a broad basis, and the foundation should be made as deep and wide as possible, if the structure is to be large and impressive.

Between these two fields of argument and decision the choice is to be made upon the basis of the individual character and condition. If one can afford the time and the money it is far better to give one's self the best training which is the broadest training. The broadest training, preceding the special training, insures the richest culture as well as the greatest professional efficiency. The world does not stand in need of more lawyers and doctors and ministers, but the world does stand in urgent need of lawyers and doctors and ministers who are vastly better trained and more amply qualified for the practice of their professions. But it is to be acknowledged that many men cannot afford the time and the money necessary for securing so pro-

longed a general and professional training. Under present conditions of specialization few lawyers can hope to enter into a remunerative practice before the age of thirty, and with the physician the age must necessarily be somewhat later.

The third principle in the choice of studies, to wit, the personal, is represented in the choice of studies upon the basis of their fitness to the character and preferences of the student himself. The studies which he enjoys he selects. The studies which he does not enjoy he declines. This principle has for its foundation the important consideration that one's preferences are indications of one's qualifications, and that one's qualifications are guides to the work which one should do in life. It is to be presumed that these likings are not slight or ephemeral, but that they are determinations or pre-determinations fundamental in and to one's being. The principle of interest is the more philosophical indication of the significance of this principle. By the student who is fond of mathematics, mathematics should be chosen. It represents to him the best and most valuable agent in the process of making himself a thinker. Mathematics gives insight, trains in orderliness of reasoning, and teaches correctness of inference. By the student

who hates mathematics, mathematics should not be chosen. It represents to him an intellectual labor and travail which cannot bring forth an adequate result. Some result will follow his faithfulness; but the result is not commensurate with the labor expended, and is not so rich as the same amount of work would bring forth in other departments of thought and of study. Therefore the student, it is said, should select those studies in which interest will add to his power in study.

Upon the basis of the choice of electives made on each of these three principles of the professorial, the professional and the personal grounds, the primary purpose is the securing of power, of intellectual power. Intellectual power has for its primary function or essence, thought. Intellectual power results in thought. Intellectual power employs itself in thought. The transfer in these last years has been a change of emphasis from knowledge to thought, from knowledge to power. The change is indeed most significant. The importance of knowledge has vanished, the importance of the power of thought has vastly increased. Knowledge in the undergraduate college has passed over from being an end in itself to being a means. Knowledge is gained for the purpose of

promoting the power to think. Information is obtained in order to secure formation. The mind is no longer regarded so much as a storehouse as it is as an engine. Memory is now made the servant and not the master of intellectual force. The power to think and the power to do because of thinking has become superior and supreme.

A course of study covering many electives is not a little akin to the old college curriculum. Such a course must necessarily give a superficial knowledge. For the earlier studies in any subject are, of course, elementary. If therefore one takes a general course, one is on the whole studying all subjects in their elements. One comes to know something about every subject without knowing everything about one subject. As knowing everything about one subject may result in narrowness, so also knowing something about every subject results in intellectual thinness.

The duty of specializing is emphasized by certain facts which have in these last times been made apparent. By specializing, I mean the finding of more than one-half of one's studies in one department of learning. By extreme specializing I mean the confining of three-fourths or more of one's studies to one field. Such specializing as is

represented by having one-half of one's work in one department is, however, the duty of most students. It is the duty of students to make themselves thinkers. The power to think is trained the more efficiently through the advanced studies. In the elementary studies knowledge is more significant both as a cause and as a result. In the advanced studies thought is more significant both as a cause and as a result. In the earlier studies the student accepts what he is told to accept, the more readily; in the advanced he finds out things for himself and accepts them for rational reasons. The best thinkers in the college, both as cause and effect, are, on the whole, the specialists; the least able thinkers are, to coin the word, the generalists.

I know of course that some good thinkers are not good scholars, and that some good scholars are not good thinkers, but in general one finds the great majority of the good thinkers among the good scholars and also a great majority of the poor thinkers among the poor scholars. One also finds a great majority of the good scholars among the good thinkers and a great majority of the poor scholars among the poor thinkers. The value of specialization as a means of training the thinker is proved by the records of the classes of 1884 and

1885 of Harvard College. Of the first twenty men in the class of 1884 at Harvard College sixteen specialized. Of the last twenty scholars in the class only four specialized. Of the first twenty men in the class of 1885 nine specialized, and of the last twenty, only two. The report of Dean Briggs, of Harvard College, for 1899-1900, shows that nine and six-tenths per cent. of the members of the class of 1900 who took the general course in the college won a degree with distinction, and that in the same class thirty-nine per cent. of those students who specialized won a degree with distinction. The showing of the class of 1899 is not so favorable in giving evidence of the high ranking of the specializing students, and other figures might tend somewhat to lessen the force of the conclusion, but the conclusion itself is I believe made evident that the best thinkers are found among those who specialize in their work, and that the thinkers the least able are found among those whose studies are of a miscellaneous sort.¹

The time of beginning to specialize in one's college course is quite as important as the degree of specialization. I believe that a good rule touching

¹ "Annual Report of the President of Harvard College, 1899-1900," page 123.

this matter would be: specialization should begin when the power to think becomes of peculiar value. The general course should cease when knowledge ceases to be of peculiar value. As I have said, the prolonged study of a subject results in profound study and profound study represents thought both as cause and effect. Miscellaneous studies cannot represent profound studies or studies profoundly pursued. For in a miscellaneous study the college course can cover only the elementary parts. In these studies knowledge is the primary condition. Therefore the time for a student to begin to specialize varies with different students, and varies according to their character, development and other conditions. But in general it should be said that it ought to begin near the middle of the course. This represents the time when a man seems to pass over from being a mere knowing animal into a thinking being.

One thing more I wish to add. The current conception that students as a rule choose soft or snap or easy courses in college is a false conception. Of course some students are lazy. Of course some students are not wise in their choice of primary or subordinate studies. Some people, be it remembered, outside the college are not always energetic

or wise. But, it is to be said, on the whole the selections which students make of their studies under a free system of choosing studies is distinguished by a desire to train themselves most efficiently for the best living and noblest service.

CHAPTER V

THE CONDITIONS

THE college is at once the creature and the creator of certain conditions mechanical, material, as well as intellectual.

I. RELATIONS TO IMMEDIATE ENVIRONMENT

One of the more evident of these conditions has reference to the relations which it bears to its own immediate environment. What does the college do for the community in which it is placed ?

The college furnishes to the community noble examples of the art of the architect and of the landscape gardener. If the college be situated in a city, like the University of Vienna, or the University of Glasgow, or like Columbia, and the University of Chicago, it offers examples of the material works of great thinkers and artists. The University of Vienna is located in a building costing seven millions of dollars, and it represents a triumph of the brain of man not unworthy of com-

parison with the greatness of Michael Angelo as embodied in St. Peter's. If a college is placed in a community in part urban and in part rural, it represents not only the work of the architect, but also the work of the landscape gardener. Oxford and Cambridge, Harvard and Yale, set forth the union of the work of the human brain and of the forces of nature. It is not simply because of scholarly interests and of personal association with the great and the good that one visits the university cities on the banks of the Cam, of the Isis, or of the Charles. There are few spots on this beautiful earth in which tree and shrub, grass and plant, touched by the hand of man, so gracefully and gloriously lend themselves to the stone and the brick, or in which hall, cloister and chapel unite the beauties of architecture with the glories of nature so well as the English Oxford and the English Cambridge. But aside from these historic and conspicuous relations of the college, setting forth examples of the art of the architect or of the gardener, it is true in general that wherever one goes he finds the architecture of college buildings standing for the best architecture of its place and time. The noblest buildings of Maine are the buildings in Brunswick and the noblest buildings

in California, and the most picturesque, are those of Stanford University.

A second advantage which the college offers to the community is one not unlike that which I have just named. The college furnishes to the community museums and libraries and art galleries for the preservation of examples of the works of nature, and of man himself; and also for the investigation of the works of nature and for the pursuit in helpful ways of the fine arts. The typical museum of the former time was rather an *omnium gatherum* than an orderly presentation of the works of nature. But the modern museum is a microcosm. I once met, walking through the Agassiz Museum, the late Doctor Elisha Mulford. He said to me in that hesitant manner which those who knew him will recognize, "I like walking through this museum. It is like walking through the whole creation." But the laboratory stands not only for the whole creation as a finished product but also for the whole creation in process of making. The art gallery, too, represents at once the finished picture, and the picture in the process of becoming.

The college also gives to the community a body of educated men and women. This body represents the teachers in the college. They have their

residence in the community for the sake of giving instruction to students. The teachers in the college are usually men absorbed in their work; this absorption tends to withdraw them from the common interests. The college community often seems to form a body separate from the general community. Those composing it are usually men possessing only a competency, living in simplicity. So far as is possible they are glad to make their services of the utmost value to the community. They are not commonly of an aggressive nature, but whatsoever lieth in them to do, which they are desired to do, they are usually glad to do. They are men therefore of that character which it is of the utmost worth to the community to have as its members. Were the college located in any particular place to cease to be in that place, they would at once remove their residence. In a small town, such as Amherst, Williamstown or Hanover, their presence composes no small share of the power and influences of the community. In a special sense, the college is the town and the town the college.

Linked with the body of the teachers is that body which is called the students. It is a cause for thankfulness that the old antagonism of the town and the gown is passing. The antagonism is

world-wide and runs back to the foundations of the oldest colleges. It has resulted in harm in many ways. But in the larger university cities of this country it has now no appreciable existence. Neither in Cambridge nor in New York nor in Cleveland does it exist. The students are simply men and women bearing themselves as gentlemen and ladies, taking their part, so far as the achievement of their special purpose allows, with the great body of other young people of the city. In every university town many of them come from other towns representing the worthiest families of each place. They bring to the college town the noblest traditions and influences of other cities. Of high aims, of excellent training, of energy, patience, and persistence, of largeness of mental vision, they represent those elements in which and through which every community is made richer and more worthy. At times they add a picturesque element to the common life which in most respects is pleasant.

In passing I allude to the advantage which the community may derive from the college in sharing in the public exercises, lectures and concerts which every college offers. The college should endeavor to speak the wise and strong word in reference to

the great issues of the time. The college has an opportunity for this public utterance which the press does not usually possess. It is a disadvantage that the press in this country is usually politically partisan. Therefore the temptation is that many public questions are discussed in a partisan spirit. But the American college is not partisan in any respect. It is searching for truth under conditions the most favorable; and its aims are the highest. Therefore its professors through public lectures may become genuine and sacred teachers of high and noble truth. Without prejudice, without passion, without any suspicion of self-seeking, their words should command confidence. So also in the representation of æsthetic and artistic work, archæological or modern, the college may serve the community.

A fifth advantage which the college bestows on the community lies in this fact: the college embodies an example of the continuity of historic life. It would almost seem that the historic life of a college is more vital and more complete than that possessed by any other corporation or institution. England is a stable and conservative nation, but among all its stable and conservative institutions none are so closely linked with the past as her uni-

versities. Italy is in many respects a conservative nation, but amid all her risings and fallings, political, social, ecclesiastical, none more adequately represents her historic life than the University of Bologna. America we do not call stable or conservative, but no institution so gathers up and embodies the best of all the early life of this country as the University on the banks of the Charles. Men may come and men may go, but the college goes on forever.

The college, furthermore, gives to the community an opportunity for educating the sons and daughters of its families at home. It is certainly well for the American family to maintain an integrity as complete as possible and covering as long a time as is expedient. The sons and the daughters go away from the early hearthstone soon enough even through the force of necessity. Therefore every father and mother appreciates the fact that, if it be possible, it is well for son and daughter to stay at home till they have passed by a year or two their twenty-first birthday, rather than to depart three years before they have reached that birthday. It is also recognized that a son or daughter can be educated at home at an expense far less than when away from home. The amount spent by each

senior at Yale College is upon an average somewhat in excess of one thousand dollars a year. A boy or girl can be educated at his own home for a sum only one-fifth or one-sixth of this large amount. To certain homes a thousand dollars devoted to each son or daughter is a bagatelle, but many homes are obliged to support all their members on one thousand dollars. There are scores of homes in college towns whose sons and daughters could never have had the advantage of a college training unless there were a college at their very doors.

There is a further advantage which the college renders the community. The college represents the means through which the community receives the youth from abroad, educates him and sends him forth with a distinct impression of the city's life upon him. In a word, the college is the method and agent by which the community trains a man. The community thus honors itself and increases its power. Is it not worth while for Brunswick to have been the residence of Longfellow during his college years? It is not worth while for Hanover to have been the college cradle of Webster and of Choate? Amherst is surrounded by the beautiful mountains and the visitor rejoices in Mount Tom and Holyoke, but the name of Beecher and of

Storrs is more illustrious than the name of any outstanding peak. A community is made great by the men who are its citizens, by the men to whom it has given birth, by the men whom it has helped to educate. What would the English Cambridge be were one to blot out the names of her poets?

Another thing which the college can do for the community is: the college furnishes opportunities of linking the lives of citizens with a life of endless existence. It offers an opportunity for an earthly immortality. Most men die and are forgotten. All men die and the integrity of the property of the richest of them is hardly as long continued as is the integrity of their own body. The college offers the opportunity of the eternal saving of that which is in its own nature transient. No material investment is so safe as that of money given to a well-founded and well-managed college. The funds given to Oxford well nigh a thousand years ago are still treasured unto a life beyond life. The students at Harvard College are now living under the benefits derived from foundations made more than two hundred and fifty years ago. The college does not go into insolvency. The trustees of a college represent usually the soundest integrity and the soundest wisdom of the community. No class of

men are on the whole better fitted to administer trust funds than the trustees of the American college.

The American college represents our Westminster Abbey for treasuring the money and the memory of the men. The man who gives an adequate gift to a well equipped American college is more sure of an earthly immortality than any other private citizen. He has given his name into the keeping of an institution which is sure to treasure his memory so long as clear thinking, right feeling, and high character are the best parts of humanity. In Memorial Hall at Cambridge on marble slabs are cut the names of Harvard men who died in the Great War. But more sure of lasting remembrance are the names of those who have given their treasure to the college. Marble and brick and granite crumble, but the college living in deathless youth preserves the works of its benefactors in the characters of those whom it trains. Upon the grave of Matthew Vassar there rests an emblematic acorn cut out of white marble. Matthew Vassar planted the first worthy college for the educating of women. It was, he would say, only an acorn, but that acorn bears his own name in the lasting remembrance of humanity. It was or it is an acorn of the same

oak which Sir Walter Mildmay planted. Sir Walter was the founder of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. When he returned to London after making the foundation, Queen Elizabeth asked him where he had been and what he had been doing. He said that he had been away planting an acorn but he said aside, "No man knoweth what that acorn may produce." And from Emmanuel College came the founders of Harvard, the founders of New England, and in a special sense the founders of a new nation.

To the larger community also the college bears relations. These relations are manifold. To only one of them do I now refer. The relation consists in what I shall call publicity. This word, rather a new word, refers largely to the advertising of the college. I now make mention of this matter in order to say that publicity by advertising is not usually a proper method for a college to use to relate itself to its larger environment. A college, being an institution of learning, belongs to the same class to which the professions belong. The members of professions do not advertise. Physicians and lawyers do not advertise; quacks and shysters do. Business institutions and corporations do advertise. A college is not a business corporation.

Worthy patients and clients are not attracted by advertising. Students likewise should not be; wise ones seldom are.

Yet it is to be said that colleges which are reputable, do advertise.

“Harvard College appears to have led in this matter, as in many others. The first advertisement of Harvard in the *Atlantic Monthly* was printed in February, 1870, and at that time occasioned much discussion as being a departure from old-time ideals of academic dignity. Since that day the habit has spread, the smaller and younger colleges taking their cue from the older institutions and painting the advantages of the college training in colors more and more glowing. A college which cannot equal Harvard’s equipment finds it quite possible to outdo the university in its advertisements. The youth in the small town finds, therefore, such bids as these: ‘College Better than University’; ‘Finest College Spirit’; ‘Every College Activity’; ‘New Science Hall has six lecture rooms, three laboratories, engine and dynamo’; ‘Long-established and dominant tone of culture’; ‘Proved power to make scholars and noblemen. . . . Studies for engineers, lawyers, doctors, business

men, scientists, teachers, preachers, completes the circle of desirability—is ideal'; 'Education par excellence'; 'Glorious location.' ”¹

The way in which certain colleges see fit to declare their advantages, tends to prove that advertising is an academic peril so great that the most effective, if not the only, method of avoiding the peril is not to advertise at all. College advertising when it is indulged in is usually just as truthful, and not a bit more truthful, than the advertising of banks and of bricks. Advertising breaks the rules of good taste usually, even if it does keep all the laws of veracity. It does indulge in, at least, intimations, if not declarations, of self-praise, and of self-laudation, which are reprehensible. Furthermore, advertising is not a part of a wise policy. A wise policy of a college in respect to the general community is akin to the wise policy of a church or of a hospital. It should seek to serve the community. Service, well consecrated, well executed, carried forward year after year, is sure to bring the results which are desired, but if a college seeks to tell the community about this service in order to attract

¹ Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: Fourth Annual Report, October, 1909; pages 118-119.

students, its ideals are lowered, its strength lessened, its atmosphere depraved, its noblest efficiency impaired.

II. IDENTITY OF EDUCATION OF MEN AND WOMEN

Among the most important conditions of the whole college question is the identity of the education of women and of men. This question is usually summed up in the word "co-education." I prefer to discuss it under the form:—whether the education of women should differ from that of men.

The fundamental elements of education are simply time and space. If time is not an agent, it is certainly a condition. If it does no work itself, all work is done in time. The time of education should be, I believe, the same for men and for women; and this same time should be as long as purse will buy and individual will allow. The desire to shorten the college course has not touched the college woman. The desire for a shorter college course has not touched the college man so generally or so deeply as may be commonly believed. It has touched the college man who proposes to devote himself to the profession either of law or of medicine, and in particular the one who proposes

to become a physician; for the man proposing to become a physician finds that it is necessary to work seven or eight years in the best professional preparation for his career. But the college woman would rather lengthen than shorten the college course. The saddest day of all the days of her college years is the day of her graduation. For both men and women, therefore, the college course should be of equal length; and the length should be, as I have said, as long as purse can buy or the will, under the influence of life's persuasive motives, allow.

In point, too, of space, or place, no variation need be suggested. The advantages of the urban location—intimate relationships with humanity and with its mighty undertakings and a training in what is significantly known as urbanity; the disadvantages of an urban location—the difficulty of being alone and the difficulty of the elimination from the personal equation of all distracting and needless factors; the advantages of the rural location—the closeness to Nature's heart, and the tendency toward simplicity of relationships; the disadvantages of a rural location—aloneness becoming loneliness, and the tendency toward what is significantly called rusticity; the advantages of the sub-

urban location—the union of town and field, of man and nature; the disadvantages of a suburban location—the having of half-town and half-field, and not a unit of either: these advantages and disadvantages are the same for the college woman and the college man. Therefore, in respect to the conditions of education, the two *principia individuationis* of time and of space, the education of women need not differ from that of men.

And yet, I should say that, in respect to the value of time and space, men and women show a certain degree of difference. Women are more sensitive to what conditions them in space, and men are more sensitive to what conditions them in time. Objects in space are more impressive to women, events in time to men. Men are more prompt in service, women more artistic in arrangement. But this difference is not sufficient to alter the main proposition.

In respect to the methods of education, I think there may be a similar conclusion. Methods may be interpreted in a great variety of ways, but I interpret them to refer to co-education, to co-ordinate education, and to separate education. Each of these methods has advantages and each of them has disadvantages. Co-education has the advan-

tage of economy, and also of directness of preparation for certain women. Co-education helps the woman who is obliged to earn her own living to become vigorous and aggressive. Co-education has, in my opinion, though not in the opinion of everybody, the disadvantage of lessening man's simplicity of educational environment. It has the disadvantage, too, of making some women mannish.

Co-ordinate education possesses the advantage of the university association, and the disadvantage of expensiveness. Separate education has the advantage of solidarity, of individuality, and of simplicity of educational environment. It has the disadvantages, in the women's colleges, of the danger of emotionalism, narrowness, and the difficulty of getting and of keeping the best teachers. In men's colleges it has the disadvantage of a certain unnaturalness and remoteness from human association. Each method, be it said, has its weaknesses and its strengths. No method has any educational patent right. Each method is good or bad, better or worse, best or worst, according to the student to whom it is applied. Therefore, the methods of education do not indicate that there need be a difference in training.

More important than either conditions or meth-

ods are the forces of education. What are the forces of education? Comprehensively, they are the teacher. What is the teacher? The teacher is the instructor who builds, who builds the timber of knowledge into the house of character. The teacher is the professor who declares his beliefs and principles. The teacher is the pedagogue who leads the child into truth, and duty, and love. The teacher is the tutor who watches and guards the student. And what is the one supreme and superb thing in this man, under different names, which makes him what he ought to be? It is a large personality. A large personality in the teacher is what makes him most worthy. One such teacher was Professor C. C. Everett of Harvard. In a personal letter, Professor George H. Palmer says of him:

“In him we had a man whom we loved as ardently as we respected. He informed his students, but he formed them too. A weighty and rounded personality was his, full of charm, of humor, of sagacity, of devoutness, of stimulus. One of our great teachers he was. The men who, while scientifically equipped, can stir their students are few. He was a person always, before and while he was a scholar.”

The great teacher, the teacher of a great personality, is required to the same degree by men and women alike.

Recently I asked a freshman class of about a hundred and fifty members, this question: "How many regular teachers did you have in your schools up to the time of the beginning of your freshman year in college?" The answers varied from "ten" to "thirty," and the average was twenty-three. I also asked the question: "How many of these teachers have had over you an influence which you can now distinctly and consciously appreciate?" The number, in the answers, ran from "six" to "none." The average was about three. In other words, as these students now judge, about one teacher in seven had had an influence so distinct that they were now able to say that influence was of value. In asking the students, who could thus discriminate some influence, what was that influence, the answer was, though expressed under various forms, "personality." "This teacher was kind to me"; "this teacher loved me"; "this teacher interested me in good reading"; "I admired this teacher for his intellectual power," were among the phrases used, but the one essential answer was "personality." Personality represents the supreme force of education.

The subject to be educated—the woman, the man, is of yet larger significance. One may

write respecting what may be called the physical physiology of woman and of man in many relations. One cannot write of comparative mental physiology of men and of women. Psychology is at best a more or less unknown field. Comparative psychology is far less known. Practical psychology—experimental, laboratory psychology—is a new science. One must wait for its conclusions. *A priori* psychology, touching men and women, is not new, but it is almost as useless as it is ancient. We do not know what the normal intellectual power of the normal woman is. Much less, therefore, do we know the relations between the intellectual powers of these two personalities. There may be tremendous differences in the mental constitution of the two sexes. That there are differences is evident. But whether these differences are based upon sex, individuality, or some other element is part of the problem awaiting solution. Lotze intimates that the principle of periodicity and the emotional element play a larger part in woman than in man. One may say that women are finer persons than men; that they are in danger of making the personal equation larger, or in danger of viewing questions as the questions bear relation to themselves and not

as the questions are in and of themselves. But these remarks are not fundamental. I only wish to say that we do not know enough about the intellect of women or about the intellect of men to say whether on the ground of sex the training should be the same or different. We do know somewhat of the intellect of different human beings, and we recognize certain differences in the training of those different beings; but how far these are sexual, and how far sex should enter into education, we do not know. Here the judge simply confesses ignorance and begs leave to take up the next point in the case.

The likeness of the education of men and women has relations to the aim of education. These principles, I think, are supreme; (1) education is to make the thinker; (2) education is to make one appreciative; (3) education is to make one righteous. These three principles are not unlike the ones which Kant, in his little essay on education, suggests. Kant says (1) that through education man is to be subject to discipline; (2) through education man is to be made a man of culture; (3) education is to give a person discretion, by which word Kant means that through his education he is made able so to conduct himself in so-

ciety that he may be liked, and that he may gain influence; (4) moral training must form a part of education.

These principles of the great philosopher, and the three to which I allude, the power of thinking, the power of appreciation, and the power of righteousness, are not essentially unlike the true, and the good, and the beautiful of the Greek. They are, too, not unlike what Huxley defines as a liberal education in a familiar passage:

“That man, I think, has had a liberal education who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure all the work that, as a mechanism, it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear, cold, logic engine, with all its parts of equal strength, and in smooth working order; ready, like a steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind; whose mind is stored with a knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of Nature and of the laws of her operations; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned to love all

beauty, whether of Nature or of art, to hate all vileness, and to respect others as himself.

“Such an one, and no other, I conceive, has had a liberal education; for he is, as completely as a man can be, in harmony with Nature. He will make the best of her, and she of him. They will get on together rarely: she as his ever beneficent mother; he as her mouthpiece, her conscious self, her minister and interpreter.”²

Thought, appreciation, and righteousness represent the aim in education. The power to think! The power to see one thing, the power to see two things, and the power to put together these two things seen and from the putting together to get a third thing—to observe, to correlate, and to infer—that is the power to think. The power to think is intellectually supreme. It is, of course, far more than knowledge. I recently asked a gentleman who knows as much, perhaps, as any one in the world about the making of steel: “What is the great lack of the men who come to you asking for employment?” At once came the reply: “The power to think.” “I can,” he said, “get men who can take my ideas and work them out;

² Huxley, “Science and Education,” page 86.

but the man I am trying to find and cannot is the man who can give me ideas or who has worthy ideas himself and can execute them." Knowledge is valuable, but in education knowledge is valuable chiefly in making the thinker. The emphasis on knowledge is altogether too strong; the emphasis on thinking is altogether too weak.

Education is also appreciation. Appreciation is what I may call intellectual valuation. It is the sense of proportion. I have also in mind a certain emotional receptivity which is able to accept all conditions and make the most of those conditions. By appreciation I mean culture; I mean *humanitas*; I mean *paideia*; I mean all that goes to constitute, in a large sense, the æsthetic.

There is also a third element in education—the element of righteousness. It is the adjustment of the individual to the highest relations of being. This adjustment is what Niemeyer refers to when he says:

"The principal task of education is to protect and strengthen early indications of goodness, so that every impulse shall gain power only as it harmonizes with the moral sense, and that the will shall be strong enough to subject the desire to the

reason—to that faculty which judges of right and wrong.”

Education, then, is represented in the three phrases: the power to think, to appreciate, and the element of righteousness. Now, are these elements of equal value for men and for women? Is it less, or more, or equally important for women to think as for men to think? Is it less or more, or equally important for women to be righteous as for men to be righteous? We can discriminate somewhat. It is more important for man to think in affairs of state than for woman, for he moves more in affairs of state. It is more important for a woman to think in affairs domestic than for a man, for she moves more in affairs domestic. Are affairs domestic more or less important than affairs of commonwealth?

It is more important for a man to appreciate architecture and the large humanizing movements, for he has more to do with such conditions. It is more important for her to appreciate the fitnesses of the home, for she has more to do with its creation and ordering. Are architecture and large humanizing movements more or less important than the sanctities and the beauties of the home? It is

more important for him to be honest in large buying and selling and to tell the truth in great concerns, for he buys more and his concerns are greater than hers. It is more important for her to be faithful in details, for such faithfulness forms the atmosphere of the home. Which is more or less important, truth or faithfulness? Ah! we might pursue the matter, but enough has been said to permit the inference that thought and appreciation and righteousness, as aims in education, are equally important for men and women.

I wish also to say a word regarding the content of education, the course of study. Of the many things that I have tried to say about the course of study, the one thing that I now wish most to say is that the differences in different studies are of very small value, provided the student is interested in the studies which he pursues. Of course, we can make our discriminations, and say that language teaches interpretation, that literature fosters culture, that mathematics trains logical orderliness, that science disciplines observation, analysis, and synthesis. We may say, or we may not say, with Lord Bacon, that "knowledge is a pyramid, whose base is history and experience. Upon these rests physics; on this metaphysics. The summit of the

pyramid is God's creative power." The chief principle and the prevailing rule is that the student will receive the most advantage from those studies in which he is the most interested. One may say, with Matthew Arnold, that literature is the great educative tool, or one may say, with Huxley, that science is the great educative tool. Each remark is equally true, and each is also equally false. Literature is an educative tool to one mind, but not at all to another mind. Science is an educative tool to one mind, but not at all to another mind. That study is precious which *finds* the student. That study is precious which is to him a minister to his new birth. Different studies have different value for different persons. Therefore, one can say, and at once, that the woman, as a woman, should not take studies different from those that a man takes. One can also say that the man, as a man, should not take studies that are different from those that a woman takes. One can say at once, and firmly, that woman should take those studies which interest and move and form her. Man should take those studies which interest and move and form him. The studies should be different, not on the ground that the one is a man and the other a woman, but

they should be different on the ground that each is an individual.

Both men and women, however, choose studies in the same fields. The most popular courses in the college for both men and women are the courses in history, English, economics, philosophy, and modern languages. Of course, the personal element enters into this choice. Some students choose instructors and not subjects—and there are advantages in this method—but when the personal element is eliminated from the equation, the humanities will be found to be the most popular topics, and also the best topics, for both men and women. This conclusion is not set aside by what Lotze says, that truth does not mean the same to men and to women. For women everything is true which fits into the system of things harmoniously. For men the true represents rather the real. Women's labors are artistic and intuitive, men's scientific.

The content of education, therefore, should be educative for both men and women, and not, to use the word which Edward Rowland Sill uses, "occupative." The occupative element too often displaces the educative. Let the educative prepare for the occupative. Let not the woman while in college be concerned much with her future occu-

pation, whatever it may be. Let not the man while in college be concerned immediately, but only mediately, with his occupation. The first concern of each is education.

On this ground, therefore, I should like to say that in practice I should not like to have a woman select many courses in domestic science at least not before her senior year, for usually these courses do not *find* her. Let not the college laboratory be turned into a kitchen. Let the larger share of her studies, even if she desire to become a teacher of domestic science, be of the liberal type. Also, I should say, let no college girl select the lighter courses of the curriculum, the merely cultural or social courses, for they do not usually *find* her. Let not the class room be turned into the parlor. I would not have the college man take courses in psychology on the ground that some time he may be a father. Do not turn the lecture room or the laboratory into a nursery. Let women and men be trained in those studies which train them to think, which will give them the power of appreciation, and make them righteous. When they are thoroughly trained to think, to appreciate, and to do right, and when, having these qualities, they are called upon to go into the kitchen, I am

sure they will apply their power of thought to the solution of the problems of the kitchen. Let them be trained to think, to appreciate, and to be righteous, and when they are called upon to train children I am sure that they will bear to this training the same essential elements.

The best lawyer is born of the student who never goes near the courts or the office until he has finished his course of studies in both the college and the law school. To think, is the lawyer's first duty. He will learn the technique of procedure and practice easily enough when he is called upon to take up procedure and practice. The best business man is not the graduate of the business college, or the business course of the high school, but the graduate of the classical course; for to think is the duty of the business man, and the power to think is best trained by the classical course of the high school or college. The business man will learn easily enough all the details about business when its principles are mastered. Train the woman and the man to think, to appreciate, and to be righteous, by such studies as will give the best training in thinking, appreciation, and righteousness. Train the man to think, to appreciate, and to do right by such studies as each believes will give him the best

training in thinking, appreciation, and righteousness. Train the woman to think, to appreciate, and to do right by such studies as each believes will give her the best training in thinking, appreciation, and righteousness. Then send each out to do one's work, to live one's life.

Yet, in doing this work and in living this life, there is a certain difference to be noted. According to the conditions of society, man is a getting animal, woman a spending animal. Although it is said that 17 per cent. of our employés are women, yet it is to be said that 83 per cent. are still men. Man's mind is fixed on earning, and on earning the largest amount; woman's on distributing, and on distributing in wisest ways. Man makes the fortune, great, small, or moderate; woman uses it—and may use it up! On account of this condition man may be fittingly trained in executive and administrative service, and woman in the knowledge of human society and of social and sociological relationships; but for both, the exact training of the sciences and the interpretative and broadening training of the humanities are of special worth.

Like a piece of music returns our question upon itself: Should the higher education of women differ from that of men? In condition, in method, in

force, in the subject to be educated, in aim, and in content, the education of women and of men may be exactly alike; for each is human. But in these six respects the education of each may be unlike; for each is an individual. The two types should not be unlike in their education on the ground that the one type is applied to the woman and the other type applied to the man; but the two types should be unlike because each member of that great part of humanity which we call "man" is an individual, and because each member of that great part of humanity which we call "woman" is an individual. As an individual every woman should adjust her education to these two conditions or forces: (1) to her native power, and (2) to her future work; and every man, as an individual, should adjust his education to the very same two forces or conditions, his native power and his future work. On this basis, of course, the education of every individual should differ from the education of every other individual.

III. FINANCIAL RELATIONS

I now come to the question of the financial conditions which attend the administration of the college.

The college is, in point of law, a charity. It is designed to serve the people. It draws its support from the people. The method, moreover, for securing support from the people is determined by the college itself. This method, for the college which is not supported by the State, consists in securing money from individuals. Individuals of large means, or of small, through gift, or through bequest, give to the support of the college. The offerings thus bestowed are not usually designed for immediate expenditure, but are given, in their principal fund, to be kept intact, and the income thereof alone to be expended. The efficiency, therefore, of the college comes to rest ultimately upon a financial basis as one of the necessary parts of its administration.

One of the first principles in the financial administration of the American college, is, that the community should provide the college with whatever income it can use with efficiency. The college, on its side, moreover, should use efficiently whatever money is bestowed upon it. The ground for the community giving its beneficence to the college is of the most general character. It represents the necessary and essential elements of the well-being and permanence of civilization itself.

The community is composed of individual men. The college ministers to the community through the training of the individual. All that scholarship and learning, association with rich personalities, membership in an historic community, can give, the college does offer through these ordinary ministries. The college is also concerned with truth. It seeks to know and to tell things as they are. Whatever, therefore, constitutes the higher elements of the community is a reason for the proper support of the college. These reasons are of special significance in the United States. For the United States represents the freest form of democracy which the world has known. These forms apparently are becoming more free with the passing generations. As government becomes the more free in its movements, institutions, and electorate, the more important it is that the individuals who compose the government should be well educated. A monarchy can afford an ignorant citizenship with far less risk to its happiness or perpetuity than can either a republic or a democracy. American political institutions demand for the preservation of the American commonwealth a general and high type of education.

The colleges which think themselves sufficiently well supported by the people are few. Most colleges know, and know keenly, that they can well use a far larger annual income than they do receive. I now think of only one college whose chief officer has seen fit to declare that it has all the money it needs. This college is not an American one. The head of Oriel College, Oxford, once said to a friend of mine, that having received the bequest of Cecil Rhodes it had all the money it could use.

The motives which lead individuals to give money to the American college are diverse. Some of these motives are of the noblest type to which I have just alluded. Such givers desire to serve the community. Other motives are of a more personal sort, yet of a high and noble type. Among these motives, perhaps, the memorial character of a gift or bequest is the more common. For the American college does represent the securest method of transmitting a movement or a name to the lasting future. President Gilman tells, in his sketch of the beginning of Johns Hopkins University, that a friend said once to Mr. Hopkins, "There are two things which are sure to live—a university, for

there will always be youth to train; and a hospital, for there will always be the suffering to relieve.”³ President Gilman also reports an interview between Mr. Hopkins and George Peabody. In that interview, Mr. Peabody is reported as saying that, having chosen a board of trustees for a great foundation for the poor of London, he for the first time felt that there was a higher pleasure and a greater happiness than accumulating money. This pleasure was in giving it for good and humane purposes. It is not improbable that this talk with George Peabody helped to move Mr. Hopkins unto laying his great foundation in Baltimore.⁴

The vastness of the sums of money which Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller and the late Dr. D. K. Pearsons have given away, awakens gratitude and astonishment. But the vastness of the amounts should not conceal from our attention the method which obtained in the giving. For, there was a method in the giving, and this method was on the whole unique, as applied to so great sums. The method was and continues to be: The gift of a certain sum usually conditioned upon the giving of a certain other sum. For instance, Mr. Rockefeller

³ “Launching of a University,” page 10,

⁴ *Ibid.*, pages 11-12.

promised and still promises to give an historic university two millions of dollars in the next four years, provided two other millions are given from other sources, or to give such a part of two millions as may be otherwise raised. Dr. Pearsons made, I do not know how many colleges, happy and unhappy by assuring them that when they had raised one hundred thousand dollars he would give them fifty thousand more.

The first thought which one has in respect to this method is that it is an exceedingly shrewd device. It is recognized as a very effective motive for promoting the benevolence of people who need a motive. It seems to carry along with itself not only evidence of the generosity of the man himself, but also evidence that he intends that every man whom he can influence shall also be generous. It is the embodiment of the method of New England theology of helping every one to do his whole duty.

But when one has taken satisfaction in this thought and feeling a second sentiment emerges. The second sentiment is rather one of revulsion; for to certain minds the process does seem to savor of compelling an individual to be benevolent against his will. It contains an intimation that the generous man and rich proposes to make everybody

else generous so far as he can. I can easily believe that an emotional and intellectual process of somewhat this character may possess a man who is approached for a gift under the conditions of this method. The agent who is securing funds asks Mr. A. B. to give a thousand dollars. A. B. replies that he will consider the need, and will do as seems to him right. "But," says the agent, "you will not forget, my dear Mr. A. B., that if you give a thousand dollars Mr. X. Y. will also give a thousand dollars; therefore your gift of a thousand means an addition to our fund of two thousand." A. B. replies: "Yes, I know; but that is no concern of mine. If your cause is worthy I will give a thousand dollars, whether anyone else gives or not. If it is not worthy, I will not subscribe a cent. If it is worthy, I will subscribe all I can. I do not let any man either cajole or force me into giving away my money against my will and judgment. If he ought to give away his million or his ten thousand, of course he ought to give it away; but his duty has no relation to my duty, or mine to his." Such I can easily believe is the mood of many a man who is approached to make gifts under the conditions of this new method.

And yet the new method does seem to me to be,

as I have intimated, worthy of commendation. The arguments in its behalf are far stronger than the arguments against it; for the amount which one ought to give is not determined alone by a narrow interpretation. The amount which one gives, or ought to give, is determined somewhat by what others give or are willing to give. Mr. Wiseheart, for instance, has a half-million dollars to give toward the founding of a college in his native town. He knows very well that a half-million dollars is too small a foundation for a college to rest upon. Yet this sum he is willing thus to invest. Is it not just and gracious for him to say: "I will give half a million dollars to found a college, provided that you, the companions of my boyhood, will give an equal sum." He lays no duty upon them which they should feel the burden of, if they have not the power of lifting it. Mr. Goodheart may also wish to build a new church in his native town. He knows that twenty-five thousand dollars is a small sum, too small to erect an adequate structure. Is it, therefore, not just and gracious in him to say to the congregation: "I have twenty-five thousand dollars in the bank awaiting your call when you put twenty-five thousand more along with it for the erection of a church"? Mr. Dowell wishes to

build a parsonage in his native town. He has five thousand dollars for this purpose; but five thousand dollars are not adequate. Is it not just and generous and gracious in him to say to the congregation that he will give five thousand dollars, provided it will raise another five thousand? His proposition lays no burden upon the church, if it has the power of raising the additional sum. In the first instance, five hundred thousand dollars should not be given to found the college, unless an equal sum is also raised. In the second instance, twenty-five thousand dollars should not be given to build the church, unless an equal sum is also raised. In the third instance, five thousand dollars should not be given to build the parsonage, unless the other five thousand dollars are also raised; for each sum in itself is inadequate for the ordained purpose. Therefore, the amount which one may properly give to the support of certain causes is conditioned on what others are inclined to give.

The new method deserves commendation also on the ground that most people do require every possible motive to maintain themselves in a just generosity. By nature most men embody very well the law of self-preservation and self-protection. We ought always to be selfward; but most of us

find our selfwardness degenerating into selfishness. We require the urging and pressure of every motive for holding ourselves to our duty in beneficence. Therefore motives which may not seem to be gracious may be wise, and motives at times which hardly seem wise may on the whole be necessary to secure the largest and most lasting results.

Yet not infrequently the result emerges in a way far less ungracious than the premises intimate. For it is a not infrequent fact that men of large power and large generosity in giving, who have conditioned their gifts upon the making of other gifts, do bestow the gifts, which they have conditionally promised, even if the conditions themselves are not fulfilled. I recall one instance of just this nature. A friend of mine had promised five thousand dollars to a certain school for young women on conditions that, as I remember, thirty thousand were raised in addition. The traditional hard times struck soon after he made this promise. It was quite impossible for the agent to raise even a tithe of thirty thousand; but my friend said to me, as if it were to him a matter of no consequence whether the thirty thousand dollars were secured or not: "Of course, I gave the five."

It seems to me, therefore, that this new method

of beneficence is, on the whole, wise and just. But it does seem to me, too, that those who make large promises conditionally upon the raising of other sums should not withhold their own conditional benefaction through the failure to fulfill the conditions laid down. This might well be the case, provided that those who are seeking to fulfill the conditions have labored in wisdom, energy and self-sacrifice.

A second principle in the financial administration of the college lies in the evident truth that the endowment should be invested in funds which are safe in the principal and regular and safe in the payment of interest. The more secure the principal and the more certain the regularity of the payment of interest, the smaller, naturally, will be the aggregate income. The funds should, of course, be absolutely secure; they are a trust. But funds which are sufficiently secure may differ in the rate of the amount of income which they offer. A United States bond sells at a higher price in the market than does a bond of the State of Massachusetts. A bond of the city of Boston sells at a higher price in the market than a bond of the Commonwealth of which it is the capital, but a bond of the city of Boston is as secure as a bond of its

Commonwealth, and a bond of Massachusetts is as safe as a United States bond. The point to be had in mind always is that the security shall be ample for the payment of the principal. Under this principle of security, the trustees should secure the largest possible income which can be paid with regularity.

The American college is investing in two forms of property for income-producing purposes. The first and less common is real estate. The second is bonds. Real estate owned by a college for purposes of income falls into the same classification as real estate held by a private investor for the purpose of getting income. Real estate is a good investment for the college, provided it is good! But real estate is in peril of not producing a certain and regularly-paid income as does a first-rate bond. If also real estate may increase in value, it also may fall. A college seldom has so good a method for looking after its real estate interests as has the private holder. It is a form of investment which requires ceaseless vigilance and far-seeing prudence. For values change rapidly and often without being properly foreseen. For its care, a college should commonly employ a special officer. Such administration is costly.

One reason against the investment of college funds in real estate lies in the ever present and serious matter of public taxation. The laws of different states regarding taxation of property used for college purposes differ, but in most states real estate used directly for college purposes is not taxed, and also most real estate indirectly concerned with administration and instruction, or which is used for income-producing purposes, is taxed. Personal academic property, in most commonwealths, is free from taxation. Therefore, it is usually expedient for investments to be made in other than real estate.

Bonds are on the whole a better form of investment for a college than real estate. Bonds also, of course, are a better form than stocks. A stock represents participation of the owner in some undertaking. The profit or loss on his stock represents the prosperity or the failure of his undertaking. It is not wise usually for college trust funds to be subjected to the uncertainty of business. Of course there are bonds, and there are stocks. A college may be fully justified in owning the stock of the Pennsylvania Railroad, when it would not be justified in owning the stock of a company subject to fluctuations more serious and more frequent

than belong to the property of an historic corporation. Good bonds, therefore, represent the bulk of the investments of the American college.

An important question emerges at this point. It is the question whether the special funds given to a college should be invested as special funds, or whether they may be pooled in the general investment. For instance, A gives \$100,000 to a college, to establish a fund, to bear his name forever. Its income is to be used for the support of the department of philosophy. On receiving this money shall the trustees buy bonds to the amount of \$100,000 in which this fund and this fund only shall be put? Or, shall these trustees put this \$100,000 with other sums and invest the whole amount in whatever values may seem to be most acceptable? Of course, in each case, the book-keeping records the facts, and proper publications indicate the facts. Colleges differ in their practice in this matter. Princeton, for instance, seems to keep every fund distinct from every other. No funds are pooled. At Harvard, no attempt is apparent to keep particular investments separate from each other. Each separate fund is credited each year or term of years with its proper share of the average interest upon all invested funds.

The chief advantage of the separate method is that the founder of a fund feels a sense of satisfaction in knowing that his gift is well invested in a certain specific value. The disadvantage of the separate form of investment is that if any loss should occur in this particular fund, the loss is borne by this fund itself. Herein also lies the advantage of a general investment. It is impossible to think that an individual fund could be entirely lost, if it is pooled with other funds of a good college. The loss at the worst could only be partial, whereas in the case of a separate investment, it might possibly be complete.

A third financial principle of the administration of the college refers to the income derived from fees for instruction. The rule obtaining is that the fees should be made as large as the community will pay. This amount depends upon the wealth or willingness of the community and also specifically upon what it thinks the instruction is worth. The community does not pay anywhere near what the instruction costs. The facts regarding several universities are significant.⁵ (See table on p. 249.)

Such a statement is gloriously and sadly significant. The American college student to-day is a

⁵ Slosson's "Great American Universities," page x.

beneficiary. Whether he deserves it or not, whether he be rich or poor, he is paying only a part of what his education costs.

I should like right here to say that there are some strong reasons for greatly increasing the fees for instruction in the American college in order to make the college more largely self-supporting. The great reason lies in the simple fact that institutions should be self-supporting. Akin to this ground is also the ground that many parents in not a few colleges are as able to pay the cost of the education of their sons as they are to give them a good home. Why should the rich men of America become beneficiaries of colleges? Why should they not pay what the education of their sons costs? The answer

Institutions	Average Expenditure for Instruction per Student	Tuition Minimum	Expenditure for Instruction per Student in Excess of Tuition Fee
Columbia University	\$280	\$150	\$130
Harvard University	209	150	59
University of Chicago	137	120	17
University of Michigan	125	30	95
Yale University	158	155	3
Cornell University	140	100	40
University of Illinois	136	24	112
University of Wisconsin	157	—	157
University of Pennsylvania	117	150	33
University of California	136	—	136
Stanford University	230	20	210
Princeton University	235	150	85
University of Minnesota	66	20	46
Johns Hopkins University	324	150	174

which they would give to such a question is absolutely clear. But a further reason lies in the fact that if those who were able should pay the full cost of the education of their sons, the college would receive so large an income that it would be able to increase the grants which it makes to needy and worthy students in paying their fees. The rich student should pay what his education costs. The poor man should not be kept away from college by reason of heavy fees. The heart goes out toward the able but impecunious men in college. They represent the heroic type. They don't know they are heroic, and they don't care for anybody to tell them so. But, nevertheless, they come as near to this type as most fellows do in this world. Such men should have education made as free to them as it can be made.

But there are one or two reasons against charging what education costs. One reason lies in the peril of the confirmation of the impression that the American college is rich. The impression does prevail. The falseness does not do away with its prevalence. The impression of the wealthy character of the college would be strengthened through any large increase in the amount of the fee to be paid. Moreover, an increase in the fee might

tend to keep away from the college students of moderate income. Some men are willing to pay what is asked for a service, even if what is asked does not equal the cost, who would be disinclined to pay the whole cost and accept of a rebate. It is moreover to be said that not all colleges could afford to charge the whole cost of the education which they give to students. For, nine-tenths of the students in more than nine-tenths of American colleges possess only moderate means. Therefore a large charge for instruction might tend to keep such men out of college. If, therefore, there are in the United States twenty colleges that might properly afford to charge the full cost of education, there are hundreds in which the fees should be and are kept small.

A fourth principle in administration relates to expenditure. The expenditure of all money gathered up from fees and from the income on investments should promote the essential purpose of a college. This essential purpose is the training of character through teaching and personality and the discovery and publication of truth. Ever and everywhere, these twin purposes are to be kept in mind. Expenditure for administration, for upkeep of buildings, for equipment of laboratories,

for the purchase and housing and using of books, are not essential and fundamental except as this expenditure promotes the ultimate and comprehensive purpose. In the last analysis, the "usefulness" of a university is measured by its mental, moral and spiritual product.

All expenses, therefore, which do not contribute to the highest and broadest, deepest, finest efficiency should be kept down to the lowest possible point. The amount of such administrative expenses rises in many colleges to higher levels than one easily believes, and the proportion is liable to rise with the increasing elaborateness of the organization of a college. Different colleges use different methods in assessing the proportion of the expenses of administration and of instruction. The proportion varies from ten per cent. to thirty per cent.

The struggle of every college is to make all expenses, except those for instruction, as small as possible. The duty of the college of making these expenses small is as binding as is the right of the college to make all expenses for instruction itself large. The highest salary paid to the teacher will not properly compensate him for his service in training character, and enlarging the boundaries of truth.

A further principle in academic financial administration has reference to what is called the budget. The budget represents the application of the principle (1) of securing the largest amount of income and (2) making the most effective expenditure. It is an annual exhibit of the forthcoming income and the forthcoming expense. In certain State universities this exhibit is bi-ennial, for the legislature meets bi-ennially. But, in most institutions, the budget is an annual presentation.

In the making of a budget two facts are of special significance. A budget should be made as far ahead of its application as all conditions allow. Such prudence permits and promotes proper adjustment, lessens friction, allays anxiety.

Most colleges act upon an annual budget at the commencement season of a college year. This budget takes effect at the beginning of the forthcoming college year in the month of September. It would prove, however, advantageous, if colleges could conclude so important a matter at an earlier date, but in many instances, earlier consideration is impossible, for a college hesitates to arrange expenditure for a forthcoming year until it knows the condition of its finances for the year which is about to close.

A second consideration to be had in mind in making a budget is that it should possess the virtue of great detail. Such detail serves to bring out into prominence possible points of economy and also possible points where more liberal expenditures are fitting. It inspires to efficiency and helps to save from deficit at the close of the year. In such a budget, of course, the stipend of each teacher is specifically named, as well as the salary of each individual administrator as president, treasurer, secretary. In the budget such items as fuel, light, insurance, printing, postage, water, telephone, repairs of buildings, janitor service, supplies for each laboratory, purchase of books, advertising, taxes, are to be noted.

A well-made budget helps to save a college and university from that conclusion known as a deficit. A deficit, in most corporations, is looked forward to with fear and looked back upon with a sense of disgust. A deficit, however, in many college accounts, is treated lightly, or as a means of inciting to beneficence. The reasons, however, against a deficit in any corporation or business, apply with equal emphasis to the college. It is no more rational to have a deficit in a college account than it is in a personal one. Exceptional conditions or

causes may create deficits, but they should not be counted upon in advance. They should be removed before they begin. Trustees are usually and rightly opposed to paying debts, but they are usually willing to meet the just obligations of the future.

If a budget represents the proper beginning of a college year, the report of the treasurer represents its conclusion. It would be advantageous if the American colleges could agree upon the elements which should constitute a treasurer's report. One of the many and great debts, which the higher education owes to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, is an intimation of a form in which a treasurer's report might be put. This model consists of three exhibits. The first has relation to resources, including the value of real estate and the amount invested in bonds, stocks, notes, etc. The second exhibit has relation to the income derived from each form of the endowment, real estate, mortgages, bonds, stocks, etc., and from the fees for tuition, and to the income derived from gifts. In the third exhibit are included the expenses, first of administration, second, of teaching, third, of accessories to teaching, fourth, of departmental appropriations, fifth, of mainte-

nance of physical plant, sixth, of advertising, and seventh, miscellaneous. Under each of these heads are several items which represent worthy details. The treasurer of every college should offer to the board of trustees such a report, as near as possible at the close of each fiscal year.

.. It also should be said that the treasurer's report should be followed by the report of a certified auditor. The funds of the American college represent as safe a record of investment and of the use of income as can be found in any institution in the world. Losses through bad judgment or through chicancery are small in amount and infrequent; but nevertheless, the accounts of a treasurer should be constantly and thoroughly inspected. Every payment should be verified, every bill examined. The statement of income as well as of expense should be carefully considered. The auditing of the accounts of a college should be regarded as important as the making of a report by the treasurer.

It is also to be said that the accounts of both treasurer and auditor should be made public. The American college established by the State is constantly and urgently appealing to the people for support. It has no right to make such appeals un-

less it be willing to report to the people what it has done with money already received. Only about a hundred of the six hundred institutions which bear the name of college, or university, in the United States and Canada, do make a proper report. It is also to be added, as says President Pritchett, "Even where such reports are published, it often happens that they furnish meagre information to the trustee or to the student of education. For example, all state universities are compelled by the law to publish a complete statement of their expenditures. Many institutions comply with this by publishing a list of all the vouchers paid during the year. Such a statement, while complying with the law, gives no real knowledge concerning the wisdom or unwisdom of the expenditures, nor does it afford any basis for comparing the work of one college with the work of another. In order that this may be done, the separate items of expenditure must be grouped under significant headings." ⁶

The making public of the reports of the treasurers and auditors of our American colleges would vastly promote the cause of the higher education among all classes. It would help to remove, among

⁶ The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Fourth Annual Report, page 115.

other advantages flowing from it, the impression that the American college is unwilling to be tested by those thorough standards of service to which most other human institutions are subjected.

CHAPTER VI

THE TESTS AND RESULTS

WE now come to the last chapter of our consideration of what the American college is and of what it may become. This chapter refers to results, and those results are comprehensively summed up in the worth and worthiness of the college.

Rashdall, in his great work "Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages," says:

"The two most essential functions which a true university has to perform, and which all universities have more or less discharged amid the widest possible variety of system and method and organization, hardly excepting even the periods of their lowest degradation, are to make possible the life of study, whether for a few years or during a whole career, and to bring together during that period, face to face in living intercourse, teacher and teacher, teacher and student, student and student. It would be a fatal error to imagine that either the multiplication of books or the increased facilities

of communication can ever remove the need of institutions which permit of such personal intercourse.”¹

These two conditions which Rashdall intimates have obtained, still do obtain, and must obtain in the organization and administration of the ideal college. Without the life of study and without the advantage of personal intercourse the college or university cannot secure its great purposes.

That the college of the present is accomplishing its high purposes, and that the college of the future will accomplish still higher purposes more adequately is to me clear. Difficulties do and will emerge as they have emerged in the past. The course of educational progress is slow. It has been slow for several centuries. “It is surprising,” again says Rashdall, “how little the intellectual superiority of the eighteenth century over the fourteenth impressed itself upon the course of ordinary School and University education, especially in this country. That on the whole a good eighteenth-century education was healthier, more stimulating, and more rational than a good fourteenth-century education need not be denied; but our intellectual ad-

¹ Rashdall, “Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,” Vol. II, part II, page 714.

vance since the mediæval period had less to do with the improvement in the substance or the method of education than the academic world complacently imagined. It was in the main what he picked up out of School and Lecture-room that differentiated the educated man of the eighteenth century from the educated man of the fourteenth.”²

Rashdall also says, “The history of education is indeed a somewhat melancholy record of misdirected energy, stupid routine, and narrow one-sidedness. It seems to be only at rare moments in the history of the human mind that an enthusiasm for knowledge and a many-sided interest in the things of the intellect stirs the dull waters of educational commonplace. What was a revelation to one generation becomes an unintelligent routine to the next. Considered as mere intellectual training, it may be doubted whether the superiority of a Classical education, as it was understood at the beginning of this century, to that of the mediæval Schools was quite so great as is commonly supposed. If in the Scholastic age the human mind did not advance, even Macaulay admits that it did at least mark time. The study of Aristotle and the Schoolmen must have been a better training

² *Ibid.*, page 706.

in subtlety and precision of thought than the exclusive study of a few poets and orators.”³

I. COMPARISON OF THE PRESENT WITH THE PAST

At the present moment, the higher education, as compared with the higher education of the past, seems to possess, among many other characteristics, four elements of peculiar significance.

First. It is more vital. The college is in close contact with the life of America and the life of the whole world. This vital intimacy has arisen, in some small part, from the increasing smallness of the world and from the greater oneness of all relationships. This condition also contains a disadvantage in the peril that the education becomes less well ordered, less thorough, and less conservative. But with all its disadvantages, it has become more thoroughly one with all humanity. If, historically, education was first human; and secondly humane; and lastly, humanistic; it is now passing through a retrograde stage from being humanistic and becoming greatly human.

Second. It is more comprehensive of the whole field of knowledge. This field has vastly enlarged. It has enlarged in each relation: physical, chemical,

³ *Ibid.*, pages 705-6.

biological and human. In the human relation is included all of what are properly called the social sciences, such as economics and psychology and the whole vast domain of literature and language. The enlargement of the field of knowledge within the memory of men who are now living, has been greater than was its enlargement in the preceding thousand years.

Third. Education has also become more individual. It has adjusted itself to the needs, abilities, purposes of the single man. Men are no longer educated by wholesale. The peculiar requirements of each student are recognized and ministered unto as they never have been.

Fourth. A fourth element of education to-day relates to its comprehensiveness of the needs of humanity. It represents the extension of the characteristic of filling the needs of the individual. All that concerns men concerns education. Nothing is foreign to it which belongs to humanity.

Notwithstanding these enlarging and enlarged advantages, yet there are two difficulties, which in certain respects are one, which should be noted.

First. The student is inclined to be, as I have already intimated, less laborious. The development of what are called "student activities" have

caused him to dissipate his energies. He has spread his work over so many surfaces that he is in danger of having only a little time and little strength left for his studies. As executive activities have increased, his intellectual activity has diminished. In many colleges outside of the lecture and recitation room an hour devoted to each lesson is regarded as the maximum.

A second difficulty, to be noted in the present consideration, is that the student is in peril of becoming less thoughtful. As he has become more active, he has less time for quiet contemplation. The training of his intellect is suffering by the exercise of his will. His reflective faculties are sacrificed to the executive and administrative.

The general changes which belong to the college of to-day are summed up in the induction that the human relations of the college have increased and have enlarged, and the scholastic decreased.

The American people have a definite idea of what their colleges ought to do for American life; but their idea of what their colleges do actually do, is very indefinite. What the graduate of thirty or fifty years' standing affirms as the value of his college to himself has worth, great worth. What the graduate of the class of 1903 says of the value of

his college to himself has also worth and it may be great worth; but the interpretation given of the value of his college by the graduate of 1863 and by the graduate of 1913 may be quite different.

II. TESTIMONY OF GRADUATES

I have lately asked one hundred men and women, just graduating, regarding the value of their college course. The replies which my correspondents are so good as to make to my inquiries may be classified under a half dozen heads; but four of the classes are specially important, and, of these four, two become of peculiar significance. These two relate to the advantage which the college offers in giving what may be called a broad view of life and of things, and in giving greater self-confidence. Of these two goods about two-thirds of my correspondents affirm that the broad view represents the more significant advantage.

These new graduates have different methods of expressing this enlarged interpretation of life; but the general meaning in all is the same. One man says: "College has made possible and almost instinctive a perception of a large part of the totality of things and affairs, together with their relationships." He also adds, in further interpretation,

which includes possibly a moral advantage as well as an intellectual, "I find myself now disposed more than ever before to weigh and estimate men and motives liberally and considerately." Another man says that one of the two chief benefits which the college has given is, "A great increase of appreciation. By this I mean a widening of my interests that enables me to find something interesting or entertaining in almost any subject or thing, and especially an increased appreciation of literature and art and nature and all that appeals to the emotional or æsthetic part of man." A woman says: "The greatest advantage which my college has given me is, I think, an awakened and ever-widening interest in people and things. At my entrance my studies claimed all my attention. Leaving, I find that people of all sorts interest me. I like to study them and trace the why and wherefore of their deeds. Everything, too, has a broader meaning for me. I am interested in music, the drama, literature in general, the current history and other things numberless—perhaps almost too broad an interest. I hope, too," she adds, "that my love for study has changed from a getting of lessons to a getting of wisdom." Other students express the same general idea in such compact forms as: "My

college course has given me a much broader conception of life. Life means more to me than ever before;" "a new world of ideas and ideals has been opened to me through contact with instructors, college friends, books"; "the college has had its influence in making me feel more at home with the world"; "it seems to me that one of the greatest advantages is the tendency to observe and to understand—to see much in little"; "the college has opened up and given a glimpse into a wide variety of almost infinite fields"; "it has broadened my ideas and ideals of life."

The enlarged sense of relationship becomes the more significant in respect to certain evident contrasts. To the question, what advantage does he expect to derive from the college, the Freshman usually answers—"a trained mind." At the close of the Senior year the same man answers, to the same essential question, "A larger vision." The answers are the same, but with a world of difference. The point of view has changed from one very subjective and personal to one outside of himself. Because the mind is trained the student does see more; but he has come to think first of what is seen, not of himself who sees.

The larger understanding of phenomena repre-

sents, too, an absence of the valuation of specific knowledge. Not a few students come to college with the thought that they are to learn, to learn one thing, to learn a few definite things. But they soon see that learning as a result of knowledge is of small value, that learning as a process is of great value, and that learning as contributing to intellectual and ethical character is of greatest value. The same general contrast obtains, too, between the graduate of the professional school, be that school law, medicine, or engineering, and the graduate of the college of liberal learning. The lawyer, the doctor, the engineer, on graduation, is not impressed with the broad view of life; he is impressed with the narrow view: "What is the law in this case?" "What is the meaning of these symptoms?" "What weight will these beams bear?" Such are the narrow questions which the graduate of the professional school must at once ask and answer. Clearness and narrowness are the characteristics of the professional mind.

This broad result, moreover, it is pleasant to believe, represents the best influences coming from Europe which touch the American college. The German university has given to the American not

so much an enlarged sympathy with life as an enlarged sympathy with knowledge, knowledge both general and specific. It aims to make scholars. The English university has given to the American not so much an enlarged sympathy with knowledge as an enlarged and quickened sympathy with life. It aims to make gentlemen. The American college and university gathers up, conserves, and projects these two great purposes; it creates an appreciation of scholarship, knowledge, learning, covering all phenomena; it invites a sympathy with life, all life;—nothing is foreign to it which belongs to humanity. Over such a result the friends of the higher education in the United States may humbly exult.

It may be worth while to say, too, that these graduates for three of the four years of their course had been choosing their studies, under a system of electives, a system of electives limited by general principles. Some had, undoubtedly, chosen foolishly, but more, far more, had chosen wisely. Yet their choices, whether made on a broad basis or with specific aims, had resulted in giving largeness of vision and of understanding. They had been saved from narrowness. The prayer of the petitioner in the Old Testament was for them an-

swered: "I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see."

It may be mentioned in passing that no essential difference is to be distinguished between the answers of the men and of the women. Each finds with equal degrees of advantage the worth of a nobler interpretation of humanity and of movements as the chief work of the college.

Several of the college men and women, almost a third, refer to increased self-confidence as a result of their course. In this result is found a certain distinct charm. For the ordinary boy or girl coming up to college is not supposed to be lacking in self-confidence. But I suppose the self-confidence of the Freshman is the self-confidence of ignorance, which vanishes with the vanishing of ignorance; but the self-confidence of the Senior is the self-confidence of the consciousness of power, a confidence which has grown with the growth of the consciousness of power. One college woman says: "The greatest good the college has given me is trust in the strength of mine own self. When I entered college I was apt to say, 'I cannot.' Now I say, 'I must,' and better, 'I can.' " A college man writes: "I no longer feel afraid to undertake a new or difficult thing merely because it is new or difficult;

but I am more inclined to take up a new problem or task just as I would enter upon the work of a new study in my college course,—as something which can be done and which I can do.” The self-confidence of the graduate is an assurance as remote from arrogance or cockeyism as are the poles apart; it is a confidence which is not content with holding the personal forces out of which it arises statically, but which is eager to use them as a dynamic.

The college graduate usually comes out with a pretty clear conception of the value of hard work as a means of making one's way. “The necessity of hard and continuous work in order to obtain anything like satisfactory results”; “how great is the necessity to work constantly and faithfully” are phrases which these new graduates use. And be it said that most graduates are willing to work long and hard at mental tasks in case such labor be their duty. The ordinary opinion, I know, is to the contrary. A leading banker writes me saying: “A young man with a college education is much more averse to putting himself down to the drudgery necessary to one entering business as a novice.” Of course, such a matter is a matter of observation and of testimony. But I know of many graduates

who, leaving college, are eager to do any work, however humble, which aids them in making themselves masters; and I believe that no one doubts that the number of such college men constantly and rapidly increases.

Both as a cause and as a result of the willingness to work hard, and to work hard in the humbler relations of any service, is found one effect of the college course. This effect is the possession of good intellectual habits. The value of good moral habits people recognize; of the value of good intellectual habits they think little and say less. But the college man knows their preciousness. One of my correspondents writes: "College training has enabled me to appreciate carefully and to practice more diligently prevision and system." Another says: "College training teaches one to go to work at any task with system and method, in the consciousness that one has acquired the ability to think through quickly and logically the questions which come up." A woman says: "I know I can concentrate my attention better and think more clearly than at the beginning of my college course." And still another, also a woman, affirms: "Above all perhaps the college has taught me that it is the person who thinks who wins." The value of good in-

tellectual habits has an illustration in the remark of the Irish cook who said to her mistress, a graduate of the University of Michigan, who had been a college president, on seeing the mistress make some good bread, "Oh! you college folks know how to do things without ever having learned." Of all great examples, too, of the worth of good intellectual habits, as I have already intimated, the mind and the work of John Stuart Mill are preëminent. Mr. Mill had from almost infancy been trained to regard and to use his mind as a machine for the perception and expression of truth, for the pointing out of duties arising from this perception, and for the doing of these duties with efficiency.

In a large number of interpretations of the worth of a college to oneself, of course, the personal equation emerges. Unique results each finds for oneself. One affirms: "The college course has taught me the value of time." Another says: "The greatest good is the ability to see how little I, as a student, know, how much there is that one must be satisfied to leave unlearned." Another writes: "The college has taught me that for a woman wisdom of the heart should take precedence of cold facts of the head. To me personally, I think this has come to be an extreme advantage."

Another graduate says: "I feel that the greatest benefit which four years' training has given me is the power to influence the life of my home. I believe that the atmosphere of our home and the lives of my parents, neither of whom was granted the privilege of attending college, has broadened as I have grown and broadened."

Among the advantages which these graduates name is one which it is pleasant to note and which is most personal. It is the advantage belonging to the development of largest and finest character. One writes: "The college has given me an ambition to become a more womanly woman"; and another says, "The college has made me more womanly." Yet another adds: "I have learned that not only the scholastic work in college, but also the grace and culture which result from things altogether remote from class-room work, is necessary to the well-trained, well-balanced woman." With a freedom, too, which under the conditions is to be commended, a man writes: "I realize that the college has made more of a gentleman of me than I would have been otherwise, perhaps."

As one reviews these interpretations of the worth of a college course made by men and women who are just closing it, one is impressed with the as-

surance that the college is becoming less collegiate, less technical, and is becoming more human. It is still making scholars, but it is making thinkers more; it is still making thinkers, but it is also making gentlemen; it is still making gentlemen, but is also and more making men.

As I read over these pages that I have written, I am constrained to believe that the general conclusion is inevitable that, for the ordinary American boy, a college education is of great worth. The career of such a man, interested in affairs, becomes larger, richer, finer. He does more things and things of higher consequence and of wider relations than if he had not gone to college. His services are of larger worth to the community. He is able to obey the command given in the first chapters of the Bible,—to dress and keep the earth,—with greater ease to himself and richer results for the earth.

Of course there are, and always will be, men of exceptional power who win great, perhaps the greatest, results, without having received the advantage of a college training. The names of such men occur to every one. Such men possess a certain prevision and breadth of vision which belong only to intellects of the first order. What the col-

lege could have done for them it is useless to ask or to prophesy. College might have hurt them; college might have helped them. I am sure that some of them would say that the college would have vastly helped them. The best and most reverent of them I am sure would say this.

But the proposition iterated and reiterated in these pages is that the college makes the ordinary youth a man of greater power and cultivation than he would have become without an academic training. The proposition is not that the college has made A better than B is without a college education. B *minus* a college may be still superior to A *plus* a college. The argument is simply that A *plus* a college course is greater than A *minus* a college course. The argument is that B *plus* a college course is greater than B *minus* a college course.

One also should not fail to recognize that a college course may cost too much. It may cost the father and the mother of the student economies and anxieties which they should not be suffered to bear. This cost the student should not ask his parents to meet. In fact, he is usually so eager that they shall not meet such expenses of purse and of heart that he labors in his own self-support while getting an education. Moreover, the student may acquire

habits of unworthy selfwardness, and self-indulgence, under the academic law of liberty, which will prove to be thoroughly harmful. But such developments are not so common as they are usually believed to be; yet even if for a time they do exist in the case of the individual, that time is commonly brief.

Still, despite the great and increasing value of these advantages, it must be confessed that some of the graduates of the college do fail, and do fail with a greater or less degree of sorrow to themselves and of harm to life's great forces.

The causes of such failure usually arise from two or three conditions. One of these conditions, stated in a most general way, lies in "weakness." This weakness, however, at once divides itself into two parts; moral and physical. Moral weakness is lack of will; physical weakness is sheer laziness. A second general cause of failure still more common and of greater significance is inability to get on with men.

Moral weakness is a matter of relations. The primary relation is that of the will of the individual to his appetites. A weak appetite may be put into the same breast with a weak will, or a strong appetite with a strong will, or a strong appetite

with a weak will, or a weak appetite with a strong will. A weak appetite *plus* a weak will results in a weak character; a strong appetite *plus* a strong will results in a strong character; a weak appetite with a strong will surely spells inefficiency; and a strong appetite joined with a weak will is a sure prophecy of ruin. The ideal condition lies in the union of the strong appetite and the strong will. Such a union gives force, progressiveness, efficiency. The greatest peril for a college man is the peril that springs from the union of a strong appetite with a weak will. From the natural results of such a condition, the college man may be saved through his intellectual good taste. Wickedness is nauseating. Every one, who knows college men, is able, however, to pick out instances in which intellectual good taste has not saved the individual from allowing his appetites to push him over moral precipices.

A second form of weakness which leads to failure is simple indolence. Be it said that to the promotion of indolence the college itself may at least indirectly contribute. One chief difference between the college and the school, whence one comes to college, is personal independence. No master stands over the college man day by day, hour by

hour. Growth in life and character is characterized by increasing independence. The student more completely becomes his own master. In this process of self-mastery will he become more severe or more lenient than are other masters? There is only one method for himself. He is to be severer towards himself than any other person can be; he is to be severer towards himself than towards any other person. He is to be a worker, wise, constant, strenuous, effective.

But a cause far more common, far more impressive, than the condition of weakness either physical or moral, in the failure of college men, is inability to get on with men. To use two words which are rather impressive, rantankerousness and cantankerousness represent this fundamental condition.

One of the great men of the last generation in England was Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke. He attained distinction as a lawyer, as a statesman, as a journalist and as an orator. But his distinction in no field was of the highest order. His native ability was great. This ability was reënforced by a first-rate Oxford education. The sun of his life finally set in a dark cloud by reason chiefly of his inability to get on with his associates. He was called "the most quarrelsome man in the world."

Although Mr. Gladstone said that he entered the Imperial Parliament with every needful equipment; and that in 1866 he was an orator at "the summit of Parliamentary distinction"; yet his "odd ways," his "curious mannerisms" and his temper made him many enemies. For his antagonists he had utter contempt. Their arguments in debate he met with sneering indifference, and their amiable weaknesses with brutality. Toward the close of his life he suffered a disaster which necessarily proved to be the close of his public career. He made in the House of Commons an unfitting allusion to the Queen. It resulted in his complete humiliation. His inability to get on with men was the primary cause of the failure of a career which ought to have been of lasting significance for the English world.⁴

Lowe was associated with Gladstone. In contrast with Lowe's lack of certain human and humane powers and purposes the character and career of Gladstone are significant. His great biographer says of him, "He was eager to do justice to all the points and arguments of other people. He sought opportunities of deliberation in order to deliberate, and not under that excellent name to

⁴ Morley's "Gladstone," Vol. II, page 417.

cultivate the art of harangue, or to overwork secondary points, least of all to treat the many as made for one. That is to say, he went into counsel for the sake of counsel, and not to cajole, or bully, or insist on his own way." His friend and colleague, Sir William Harcourt, spoke of him after his death saying, "I have heard men who knew him not at all, who have asserted that the supremacy of his genius and the weight of his authority oppressed and overbore those who lived with him and those who worked under him. Nothing could be more untrue. Of all chiefs he was the least exacting. He was the most kind, the most tolerant, he was the most placable."⁵ The great qualities of mind and heart of Mr. Gladstone might have been rendered ineffective for human betterment by his simple inability to get on with men. Having this virtue and this grace of cooperation, both by nature and by cultivation, his career was helped on toward its great achievements and consummations.

In the spring of 1906 there died one of the more conspicuous officers of Harvard College, Professor Nathaniel Southgate Shaler. On the afternoon of his funeral the shops in Old Cambridge were shut, an honor that had not been paid to any

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, pages 530-531.

other Harvard College professor for many years. Professor Shaler was a Kentuckian. When he came to Harvard College, and for a long time afterward, the faculty was chiefly composed of men who had had Harvard training and were typical New Englanders. He brought with him the traditions of another civilization, of more genial manners and of more outspoken opinions. In the Civil War he had fought for the Union, but half of his people were Confederates. So he learned early to steer his course amid two conflicting systems; and, above all to get on with men of antagonistic principles. Professor Shaler represents the type of man who succeeds in part by reason of getting on well with men.

It is easy to give evidence of the worth of a college training by citing figures regarding the proportion of graduates in any field of endeavor who have rendered first-rate or second-rate service. Many such computations have been made in recent years. I content myself, however, with referring to one⁶ which is more or less significant. I have made an examination of the six volumes of "Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography." The persons included in this survey are Americans, and

⁶ "Within College Walls," pages 160-162.

the larger share of them were born in America. Those who were not so born have here lived and wrought. The volumes are supposed to include more than fifteen thousand important persons in American history. The exact number is 15,142, of which 5,326 were graduates, or slightly more than one-third.

It is to me exceedingly significant that so large a proportion are college-bred. The whole number of graduates of American colleges from the beginning until the publication of this Cyclopedia does *not certainly exceed* two hundred thousand. The number may be nearer one hundred and fifty thousand. Of these, five thousand have done such work as to deserve a memorial more or less permanent. According to the larger estimate, one man, therefore, in every forty men graduating has thus deserved well. I recently asked a distinguished professor of American history how many persons had ever lived in America. He was unable to give an answer. I assume that at least a hundred millions of people, who have lived and whose dust mingles with the common dust of this new soil, have not had a college training. Yet out of these hundred millions only ten thousand have so wrought as to deserve such recognition as is found

in a cyclopedia of biography. Only ten thousand out of ten thousand times ten thousand! Therefore only one out of every ten thousand. But of the college men one in every forty has attained such a recognition. Into one group gather together ten thousand infants and send no one to college: one person out of that great gathering will attain through some work a certain fame. Into another group gather forty college men on the day of their graduation, and, out of these forty, one will attain recognition. It is not very hard to see how far the proportion is in favor of the college man—two hundred and fifty times. I will not vouch for the mathematical accuracy of these estimates; but I do say that they are true in their general impression and significance.

We are not to forget that men who go to college are in a sense picked men. Many of them, without going to college, would have wrought conspicuously well. The abilities which impelled them to give themselves the best training for doing their work would have still proved somewhat efficient without the training. The circumstances and conditions which influenced them toward the college would have proved to be generous incentives for the rendering of noble service, were they bereft of the

advantages which the college provides. But after all deductions are made, it is still just to say that the chances are vastly in favor of the man of college training rendering the ablest and most distinguished service to humanity.

In respect to the service which has been rendered in one field of endeavor by the higher education, namely, the political field, it may be worth while to refer to a university which is, in certain respects, the most American of all universities, the University of Michigan. At the present time of writing no less than twenty-seven former members of the university are now members of the Senate or of the House of Representatives of the United States. The delegation is larger than is found coming from any other institution. Harvard has sixteen, Yale and the University of Virginia are tied for third place with fifteen each, and others run as follows: University of Iowa ten, University of Wisconsin and Cumberland University nine each, Georgetown University eight, Columbia University and the University of Chicago seven each, Washington and Lee University six, University of Pennsylvania, Vanderbilt, University of Missouri and Cincinnati Law School five each, Princeton, Amherst, Trinity, University of South Carolina, Dartmouth, Uni-

versity of the South, University of Arkansas, Tulane University, Bowdoin, Albany Law School, and the University of Texas four each.

The whole survey is significant, not only of the richness of the contribution made by the University of Michigan, but also by more than a score of other outstanding colleges.

In the struggle for definiteness of results of college life and training, for results which can be minted and can be made coin of the intellectual or material realm, one is liable to forget results which appeal to the heart and the sensibilities of man. One is prone to neglect the pure element of noble joy and of rich exultation which belong to the college. Such worths arising from the higher intellectual fields are not to be lightly passed over. College life is indeed to be made happy, if, as an Oxford poet who died recently, says:

“Youth will not till the field without the flower,
Nor, pricked by thorns too early, seek the crown.”⁷

College life must be made happy, and happy not in the horse-play, hazings, and capturings that prevail, but happy in such relations as Green tells of:

⁷ Arthur Gray Butler (1831-1909), “The Master.”

"With all its faults of idleness and littleness there is a charm about Oxford which tells on one, a certain freshness and independence, and besides a certain geniality of life such as one doesn't find elsewhere. . . . The shadow of Oxford is better than the substance of other places."⁸

Happy, too, this college life must be, in its friendships and companionships, for as Andrew Lang, who loved St. Andrews more than he loved Oxford, says:

"The one duty which that University, by virtue of its very nature, has never neglected, is the assembling of young men together from all over England, and giving them three years of liberty of life, of leisure, and of discussion, in scenes which are classical and peaceful. For these hours, the most fruitful of our lives, we are grateful to Oxford, as long as friendship lives; that is, as long as life and memory remain with us. And, 'if anything endure, if hope there be,' our conscious existence in the after-world would ask for no better companions than those who walked with us by the Isis and the Cherwell."⁹

The ideal college in the New World should seek to steep itself in sentiment, and even sentimentality. It should keep itself aloof from hard and dry materialism. It should learn that man is not wholly intellectual, much less materialistic. The ideal col-

⁸ John Richard Green, "Oxford Studies," page 257.

⁹ Andrew Lang, "Oxford."

lege should be as a son of Oxford has said of Oxford:

If not "the sanctuary of sweet superstitions and exquisite fallacies and rebel unreason and unpractical theories and gentle seditions of thought"—it is at least "the home of beautiful chivalries and great ideas and gracious ideals and sublime impossibilities."¹⁰

Let our colleges deserve in some measure at least the undying epithets which Matthew Arnold gives to his own Oxford: "So serene," "adorable dreamer, whose heart has been so romantic," of "ineffable charm," "calling us nearer to the true goal of all of us, to the ideal, to perfection."¹¹ Thus the ideal college shall have gone a long way in becoming a real creation.

¹⁰ Frederick William Orde Warde, "To My Alma Mater."

¹¹ Matthew Arnold's "Essays in Criticism," 1865.

INDEX

INDEX

A.

Advertising by colleges, 214 ff.
 Amherst College, allusion to, 121.
 Arnold, Matthew, allusion to, 229.
 quotation from, 288.
 Athletics, advantages and disadvantages of, 137 ff.
 versus scholarship, 94 ff.
 Auditor, report of, 256.
 Austen, Jane, quotation from, 134.

B.

Bacon, quotation from, 228-29.
 Bagehot, allusion to, 26-27, 31.
 quotation from, 16 ff, 132-33.
 Baker, quotation from, 88 ff.
 Bascom, allusion to, 69-70.
 Baseball, 137 ff.
 Beneficence, conditional, 238 ff.
 Benson, quotation from, 135.
 Boston University, allusion to, 38.
 Bowen of Harrow, allusion to, 134-35.
 Briggs, quotation from, 200.
 Browning, quotation from, 5.
 Budget, 253 ff.
 Business and the college, 97.

C.

Carlyle, allusion to, 179.
 Carnegie, Andrew, allusion to, 238.
 Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, quotation from report of, 58 ff.

Citizenship in liberal education, 17 ff.
 College, advertising by, 214 ff.
 and trustees, 26.
 conditions of, 203 ff.
 contrast of present with past, 262 ff.
 definition of, by New York Education Department, 25.
 difference from school, 1.
 difference from university, 1.
 financial relations of, 234 ff.
 methods and tools of, 190 ff.
 moral values in, 175.
 preparing for business, 97.
 purpose of, 3 ff.
 rebellions, 110 ff.
 spirit, 126.
 students, self-government of, 104 ff.
 testimony of graduates regarding worth of, education, 265 ff.
 work of, for community, 203 ff.
 Community, duty of, to support college, 235 ff.
 work of college for, 203 ff.
 Conditional beneficence, 238 ff.
 Cottingham, quotation from, 24-25.
 Course of study, 190 ff.
 principles for selecting, 191 ff.
 personal, 191 ff.
 professional, 191 ff.
 professorial, 191 ff.

D.

- Democracy and the thinker, 21 ff.
 in relation to scholarship, 19 ff.
 Dormitory, life in, 123 ff.
 name of, 123 ff.
 Draper, quotation from, 2.

E.

- Education, citizenship in liberal,
 17 ff.
 efficiency in, 9 ff.
 liberal, definition of, 3 ff.
 of men and women, identity of,
 216 ff.
 place of religion in, 149 ff.
 practical, 182 ff.
 Efficiency in education, 9 ff.
 Elective system of studies, 95 ff.
 Eliot, George, allusion to, 71.
 President, quotation from, 38.
 Elizabeth, Queen, allusion to, 213.
 Emmanuel College, allusion to,
 213.
 English university versus Ger-
 man, 268-69.
 Everett, C. C., interpretation of,
 220.

F.

- Faculty, 49 ff.
 methods of securing, 50 ff.
 Fees for instruction, 248 ff.
 Financial relations, 234 ff.
 Fitch, quotation from, 107.
 Football, 137 ff.
 Fraternities, allusion to, 121 ff.
 discussion of, 135 ff.
 Freedom, academic, 72 ff.
 Freshman, contrast of, with sen-
 ior, 267.
 Fuller, Thomas, allusion to, 42.
 Funds, investment of, 244 ff.

G.

- Gentleman, the, in a liberal edu-
 cation, 14 ff.
 German university versus Eng-
 lish, 268-69.
 Gilman, quotation from, 32, 237 ff.
 Gladstone, allusion to, 178.
 Graduates, causes of failure of,
 277 ff.
 testimony of, regarding worth
 of education, 265 ff.
 Greeley, allusion to, 13.
 Green, J. R., quotation from, 287.

H.

- Hall, quotation from, 79.
 Hanus, quotation from, 2.
 Harvard College, allusion to, 200.
 first scholars in, 101.
 students, allusion to, 79.
 Hopkins, Mark, allusion to, 118.
 Huxley, quotation from, 224-25.
 Hyde, quotation from, 18.

I.

- Instruction, fees for, 248 ff.

J.

- Johns Hopkins University, 34-35.
 allusion to, 237 ff.
 Jowett, quotation from, 71.

K.

- Kant, quotation from, 223-24.
 Kelvin, Lord, allusion to, 29, 52.
 Kipling, quotation from, 125.
 Kirkland, allusion to, 40.

L.

- Lang, Andrew, quotation from,
 287.
 Law, profession of, improvement
 in, 11 ff.

- Liberal education, definition of, 3 ff.
 Lotze, allusion to, 222.
 Lowell, J. R., quotation from, 116-17, 126.
- M.
- Maine, quotation from, 104-05.
 Manners, value of, to student, 174.
 Medicine, profession of, improvement in, 11 ff.
 Michigan, University of, allusion to, 285.
 Mildmay, allusion to, 213.
 Mill, allusion to, 273.
 contrast with Spencer, 179 ff.
 quotation from, 179.
 Milton, quotation from, 8.
 Moral values in college, 175.
 Morley, quotation from, from *Life of Gladstone*, 280 ff.
 Mulford, quotation from, 205.
- N.
- Newman, allusion to, 132.
 quotation from, 2-3.
 Niemeyer, quotation from, 226-27.
- P.
- Palmer, allusion to, 8, 68-69.
 quotation from, 220.
 Pasteur, allusion to, 29.
 Pattison, Mark, quotation from, 17-18.
 Peabody, George, allusion to, 238.
 Pearsons, D. K., allusion to, 238.
 Practical education, 182 ff.
 President, functions of, 38 ff.
 satisfactions of, 43 ff.
 Princeton University, allusion to, 32.
 Pritchett, quotation from, 257.
- R.
- Rashdall, quotations from, 259 ff.
- Real estate as college investment, 245 ff.
 Rebellions, college, 110 ff.
 Religion, place of, in education, 149 ff.
 Rockefeller, allusion to, 238.
- S.
- Salaries of professors, 57 ff.
 Scholar not to be narrow, 4 ff.
 Scholars, first, becoming first men, 100 ff.
 Scholarship in relation to democracy, 19 ff.
 School, difference of, from college, 1.
 Seeley, quotation from, 121 ff.
 Self-government of college students, 104 ff.
 Self-support of college students, 165 ff.
 Senior, contrast of, with Freshman, 267.
 Shaler, allusion to, 281-82.
 Sherbrooke, Viscount, allusion to, 279 ff.
 Sill, E. R., quotation from, 230.
 Slosson, quotation from, 248.
 Smith, Adam, quotation from, 62 ff.
 Specialization, 198 ff.
 Spencer, contrast with Mill, 179 ff.
 Stanley, allusion to, 71.
 Stirling-Maxwell, quotation from, 14.
 Student, 75 ff.
 Students, government of, in colonial colleges, 105 ff.
 misconceptions made by, 170 ff.
 plan of work of, 80 ff.
 self-support of, 165 ff.
 to be thinkers, 86 ff.
 value of manners to, 174.
 Sunday a day of rest and worship in college, 157 ff.

Sympathy an element of liberal
education, 7.

T.

Tait, quotation from, 128.
Taylor, Samuel H., allusion to, 93.
Teacher, function of, 10 ff.
Tennyson, quotation from, 130-31.
Thayer, W. R., quotation from,
100 ff.
Thinker, the, and democracy, 21 ff.
definition of, 5 ff.
student to be, 86 ff.
Thring, Lord, quotation from, 184.
Times, London, quotation from,
183-84.
Toynbee Hall, allusion to, 157.
Treasurer, report of, 255.
Trustees, function of, 26 ff.
in investing funds, 33-34.
methods of election of, 37.
size of board of, 37 ff.

U.

University, difference of, from col-
lege, 1.
German versus English, 268-69.

V.

Vassar, Matthew, allusion to, 212.
Vocation, choice of, 177 ff.

W.

Warde, F. W. O., quotation from,
288.
Warren, allusion to, 38-39.
Webster, Daniel, quotation from,
85.
Westcott, allusion to, 129.
Williams College, allusion to,
108 ff.
Woodberry, quotation from, 76.
Women, identity of education of,
with that of men, 216 ff.

Y.

Yale College, first scholars in, 103.

Symposium on elements of liberal
education . . .

7

Tanaka quotation from 128
Tanner, Benjamin H. allusion to 18
Tanner's function of 112
Tanner's quotation from 126-27.
Tanner, W. K. quotation from
126 ff.
Tanner, W. and Company. 21 ff.
Tanner's of 29
Tanner's to 26 ff.
Tanner's and quotation from 134.
Tanner, London, quotation from,
133-34
Tanner Hall, allusion to, 157.
Tanner, report of, 255.
Tanner, function of, 26 ff.
in investing funds, 33-34.
methods of election of, 37.
size of board of, 37 ff.

University difference of form and
age . . .

German versus English. 202-03.

T

Tanner, Benjamin H. allusion to 18
Tanner's function of 112

W

Warde, F. W. O. quotation from,
204

Warren, allusion to, 34-35.

Webster, Daniel. quotation from,
55.

Westcott, allusion to, 129.

Williams College. allusion to,
106 ff.

Woodberry, quotation from, 76.

Women, identity of education of,
with that of men. 216 ff.

Y

Yale College, first scholars in, 103.

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.

Please return promptly.

~~JUN 16 1941~~

~~JUN 19 1946~~

APR 19 1951

MAR 19 1953

AUG 11 1959

APR 15 1960

WIDENER
BOOK DUE

NOV 9 1981

CANCELLED
72866

JUN 26 1986

CANCELLED
2002

WIDENER

JAN 23 2002

BOOK

WIDENER

JAN 02 2002

BOOK DUE

